

THE BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, October and December. The March issue carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association.

Annual Subscription Rate, \$4.00. To members of Association colleges special rates are offered: (individual subscriptions, \$2.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, \$1.00 each.

THE BULLETIN is available in microfilm edition through University Microfilms, 312 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1934, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 26, 1935, embodied in Paragraph (c-2) Section 3626 P. L. & C. of 1935.

BUSINESS PRESS, INC.
LANCASTER, PA.

Association of American Colleges Bulletin

VOLUME XLII

MARCH, 1956

NUMBER 1

F. L. WORMALD
Editor

BERTHA TUMA
Associate Editor

HELEN M. KOLODZIEY
Assistant Editor

Published by the
Association of American Colleges
N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Office
Office of Executive Director, Theodore A. Distler
726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1956-57

PRESIDENT: Arthur G. Coons, *President, Occidental College.*

VICE PRESIDENT: J. Ollie Edmunds, *President, Stetson University.*

TREASURER: William W. Whitehouse, *President, Albion College.*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Theodore A. Distler.

PAST PRESIDENT: Joseph R. N. Maxwell, *President, Boston College.*

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

1957—Frank H. Sparks, *Chairman, Board of Trustees, Wabash College.*

1958—G. D. Humphrey, *President, University of Wyoming.*

1959—David A. Lockmiller, *President, University of Chattanooga.*

1960—Vincent A. McQuade, *President, Merrimack College.*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EMERITUS: Guy E. Snavely, *Chancellor, Birmingham-Southern College.*

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE:

1957—William S. Carlson, *President, State University of New York.*

Brother E. Stanislaus, *President, LaSalle College.*

Logan Wilson, *President, University of Texas.*

1958—Louis T. Benezet, *President, Colorado College, Chairman.*

Albert E. Manley, *President, Spelman College.*

C. Hoyt Watson, *President, Seattle Pacific College.*

1959—Margaret Clapp, *President, Wellesley College.*

Samuel B. Gould, *President, Antioch College.*

Andrew C. Smith, *President, Spring Hill College.*

COMMISSION ON THE ARTS:

1957—Calvert N. Ellis, *President, Juniata College.*

Daniel Z. Gibson, *President, Washington College, Chairman.*

David A. Lockmiller, *President, University of Chattanooga.*

William J. Scarborough, *President, West Virginia Wesleyan College.*

1958—Carl C. Bracy, *President, Mount Union College.*

Harry L. Dillin, *President, Linfield College.*

Sister Catherine Francis, *President, College of St. Rose.*

Edward Lund, *President, Alabama College.*

1959—John S. Dickey, *President, Dartmouth College.*

Robert P. Ludlum, *President, Blackburn College.*

Hugh F. McKean, *President, Rollins College.*

Robert A. L. Mortvedt, *President, Bethany College, Kansas.*

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION:

1957—Hunter B. Blakely, *Secretary, Division of Higher Education, Presbyterian Church in the U. S.*

James Franklin Findlay, *President, Drury College.*

Theodore M. Hesburgh, *President, University of Notre Dame.*

Robert N. Montgomery, *President, Muskingum College.*

Frank A. Rose, *President, Transylvania College.*

1958—I. Lynd Esch, *President, Indiana Central College*, Chairman.
John O. Gross, *Executive Secretary, Board of Education, Methodist Church*.

Stephen W. Paine, *President, Houghton College*.

Celestin J. Steiner, *President, University of Detroit*, Vice Chairman.

W. J. Trent, *President, Livingstone College*.

1959—Carlyle Campbell, *President, Meredith College*.

Peyton N. Rhodes, *President, Southwestern at Memphis*.

C. Hoyt Watson, *President, Seattle Pacific College*.

Frederick E. Welfle, *President, John Carroll University*.

J. Wilhelm Ylvisaker, *President, Luther College*.

Ex officio: Frederick G. Hochwalt, *Secretary General, National Catholic Educational Association*.

Hubert C. Noble, *General Director, Commission on Christian Higher Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.*

Secretary-Treasurer: Guy E. Snavelly, *Chancellor, Birmingham-Southern College*.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND INDUSTRY:

Members of the Action Committee:

Chairman—Frank H. Sparks, *Chairman, Board of Trustees, Wabash College*.

Secretary—H. E. Hastings, Jr.

Presidents of Member Colleges:

1957—W. Patrick Donnelly, *Loyola University, Louisiana*.

1958—James P. Baxter, III, *Williams College*.

1959—W. Terry Wickham, *Heidelberg College*.

1960—Carter Davidson, *Union College, New York*.

1961—Frank A. Rose, *Transylvania College*.

Associate Members (executive directors of state or regional foundations):

1957—B. J. Kemper, *Minnesota*.

1958—Harold K. Schellenger, *Ohio*.

1959—A. Merrill Allyn, *Pennsylvania*.

1960—Frank A. Tredinnick, *New England*.

1961—A. Lea Booth, *Virginia*.

Additional Members of the Commission: all presidents of state or regional foundations during their tenure of that office.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES:

1957—Mark H. Ingraham, *Dean, College of Letters and Science, University of Wisconsin*, Chairman.

Edward G. Jacklin, *President, St. Joseph's College, Pennsylvania*.

George M. Modlin, *President, University of Richmond*.

1958—P. Milo Bail, *President, University of Omaha*.

Walter C. Langsam, *President, University of Cincinnati*.

R. McAllister Lloyd, *President, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association*.

- 1959—Luther H. Foster, *President, Tuskegee Institute.*
 Perry E. Gresham, *President, Bethany College, West Virginia.*
 John A. Morrison, *President, Anderson College, Indiana.*

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION THROUGH EDUCATION:

- 1957—Jaime Benitez, *President, University of Puerto Rico.*
 Harry L. Dillin, *President, Linfield College.*
 Clemens M. Granskou, *President, St. Olaf College.*
 Ralph C. Hutchison, *President, Lafayette College.*
 Jay F. W. Pearson, *President, University of Miami.*
 1958—George C. S. Benson, *President, Claremont Men's College.*
 W. Patrick Donnelly, *President, Loyola University, Louisiana.*
 Harlan H. Hatcher, *President, University of Michigan.*
 Albert C. Jacobs, *President, Trinity College, Connecticut.*
 George N. Shuster, *President, Hunter College of the City of New York.*
 1959—Horace M. Bond, *President, Lincoln University.*
 Howard R. Bowen, *President, Grinnell College.*
 V. R. Edman, *President, Wheaton College, Illinois.*
 Francis S. Hutchins, *President, Berea College, Chairman.*
 Herrick B. Young, *President, Western College for Women.*

COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION:

- 1957—Gordon Keith Chalmers, *President, Kenyon College.*
 Harry David Gideonse, *President, Brooklyn College.*
 Jay F. W. Pearson, *President, University of Miami.*
 William F. Quillian, Jr., *President, Randolph-Macon Woman's College.*
 Courtney C. Smith, *President, Swarthmore College.*
 1958—M. Ellis Drake, *President, Alfred University.*
 Douglas M. Knight, *President, Lawrence College.*
 Otto F. Kraushaar, *President, Goucher College.*
 Charles F. Phillips, *President, Bates College.*
 Richard D. Weigle, *President, St. John's College, Maryland, Chairman.*
 1959—Robert E. Long, *President, Park College.*
 Edward McCrady, Jr., *President, University of the South.*
 Robert W. McEwen, *President, Hamilton College.*
 Rosemary Park, *President, Connecticut College.*
 William G. Ryan, *President, Seton Hill College.*

COMMISSION ON PREPARATION FOR PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE STUDY:

- 1957—Edward B. Bunn, *President, Georgetown University.*
 William W. Edel, *President, Dickinson College.*
 Boyd C. Patterson, *President, Washington and Jefferson College.*
 1958—Albert W. Dent, *President, Dillard University.*
 William W. Hall, *President, Franklin and Marshall College.*
 O. P. Kretzmann, *President, Valparaiso University, Chairman.*
 1959—D. W. Bittinger, *President, McPherson College.*
 Wilson H. Elkins, *President, University of Maryland.*
 Arthur A. Hauck, *President, University of Maine.*

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS:

- 1957—Hugh M. Tiner, *President, George Pepperdine College.*
Carl R. Woodward, *President, University of Rhode Island.*
Ralph L. Woodward, *President, Central College, Missouri.*
1958—Norman P. Auburn, *President, University of Akron.*
Louis J. Long, *President, Wells College, Chairman.*
Joe J. Mickle, *President, Centenary College.*
1959—Charles J. Armstrong, *President, Pacific University.*
Ambrose J. Burke, *President, St. Ambrose College.*
Peter Sammartino, *President, Fairleigh Dickinson College.*

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION:

- 1957—H. Ellis Finger, Jr., *President, Millsaps College.*
Richard V. Moore, *President, Bethune-Cookman College.*
William H. Shephard, *President, Washington Missionary College.*
Robert J. Slavin, *President, Providence College.*
1958—Buell G. Gallagher, *President, City College of the City of New York.*
Harry V. Masters, *President, Albright College.*
Earl A. Roadman, *President, Morningside College.*
Sharvy G. Umbeck, *President, Knox College.*
1959—Weimer K. Hicks, *President, Kalamazoo College.*
Laurence J. McGinley, *President, Fordham University.*
Louis W. Norris, *President, MacMurray College.*
J. Conrad Seegers, *President, Muhlenberg College, Chairman.*

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION:

- 1957—James P. Baxter, III, *President, Williams College.*
Charles J. Turck, *President, Macalester College.*
1958—John R. Cunningham, *President, Davidson College.*
R. H. Fitzgerald, *Chancellor Emeritus, University of Pittsburgh.*
1959—David D. Henry, *President, University of Illinois.*
Sister Mary Patrick, *President, Trinity College, District of Columbia.*

REPRESENTATIVES ON NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING:

- 1957—Morgan S. Odell, *President, Lewis and Clark College.*
Nils Y. Wessell, *President, Tufts College.*
1958—Paul C. Reinert, *President, Saint Louis University.*
Hubert Searcy, *President, Huntingdon College.*
1959—Miller Upton, *President, Beloit College.*
Martin D. Whitaker, *President, Lehigh University.*

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS:

The President, the Vice President and the Executive Director of the Association, *ex officio.*

NOTE: The year shown is in each case the year of the Annual Meeting at which the term of office expires.

CONTENTS

The College and the Community, <i>A. D. P. Heeney</i>	7
Liberal Arts: The Years Ahead, <i>Herold C. Hunt</i>	14
Do We Believe in Education?, <i>Goodrich C. White</i>	22
The Garden and the Grove, <i>Theodore A. Gill</i>	35
Liberal Scholarship and Christian Tradition, <i>Robert J. Henle</i>	42
The Role of Women in American Economic Life, <i>Louis W. Norris</i>	51
Industrial Support for the Women's College, <i>Otto F. Kraushaar</i>	61
The Work and Policies of the Kresge Foundation, <i>Howard C. Baldwin</i>	68
Giving Away Money Is a Difficult Job, <i>G. Harold Duling</i>	73
Foundation Operating Policies, <i>John W. Gardner</i>	78
Teaching: A Teacher's Appraisal, <i>Byron K. Trippet</i>	86
Teaching: A Student's Appraisal, <i>Millard Susman</i>	91
Rediscovering the Founding Fathers, <i>Lyman H. Butterfield</i>	95
Liberal Education: The Years Ahead, <i>Franc L. McCluer</i>	110
Meeting of Presidents' Wives, <i>Alice Distler</i>	114

REPORTS OF ASSOCIATION COMMISSIONS

Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, <i>Louis T. Benezet</i>	116
Commission on the Arts, <i>Daniel Z. Gibson</i>	118
Commission on Christian Higher Education, <i>Harold L. Yochum</i>	120
Commission on Colleges and Industry, <i>Frank H. Sparks</i>	123
Committee on Insurance and Annuities, <i>Mark H. Ingraham</i>	126
Commission on International Cooperation Through Education, <i>Francis S. Hutchins</i>	132
Commission on Liberal Education, <i>Richard D. Weigle</i>	133
Commission on Preprofessional Education, <i>O. P. Kretzmann</i>	137
Commission on Public Relations, <i>Louis J. Long</i>	141
Commission on Teacher Education, <i>Maurice O. Ross</i>	142

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE YEAR

Report of Board of Directors	144
Report of Treasurer, <i>J. Ollie Edmunds</i>	151
Report of Executive Director, <i>Theodore A. Distler</i>	154
Representation of the Association in 1955	162

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS

Minutes of the 42nd Annual Meeting	165
Members of the Association	174
Constitution and By-Laws	194
Former Presidents of the Association	198
Editorial Notes	199
Book Review:	
The Restoration of Learning, <i>William K. Selden</i>	203
Among the Colleges	205
New College Presidents	208

THE COLLEGE AND THE COMMUNITY

A. D. P. HEENEY

CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

YOU will not expect a diplomat to make much contribution to the general theme of these meetings—"Liberal Education: Scholarship and Teaching." In the past—even the relatively recent past—there have been ambassadors in Washington, like Bryce and Jusserand, who have made notable contributions to scholarship. But alas that is no longer probable, for in these days the life of a head of mission in what—with the possible exception of Moscow—must surely be the busiest capital in the world provides little opportunity for "extracurricular" study. Nor is it such as to induce that atmosphere of calm detachment most compatible with scholarly endeavor. The sad fact is that the speed of modern communications and the complexity and urgency of current international business have produced an endless diplomatic assembly line at which most embassies are now compelled to labour without the benison of an eight-hour day.

On the other hand I suppose it might be said that diplomats do occupy a good part of their time and effort in at least two of the processes of teaching—analysis and exposition. For the diplomat must not only explain and justify abroad the actions and policies of his own government; he must also seek to interpret at home the views and objectives of the country where he plies his trade.

I have been fortunate these past two and a half years in journeying into many different parts of this varied and stimulating land. And I have met hundreds—I suppose even thousands—of Americans, individually and in groups, in various departments of your nation's life. This has been an exciting and memorable experience and one which has been most helpful in increasing my understanding of your countrymen.

Perhaps the most profitable of my sorties from Washington—certainly in this company I can admit them to have been among the most pleasant—have been my visits to several of the institu-

tions represented in this Association. I am thinking especially of some of the smaller colleges in the less populous and—from the Washington point of view at any rate—more remote parts of the United States. I have greatly enjoyed these experiences and you have been most hospitable. Recently my colleague, the Minister at our Embassy, in a more calculated endeavour—in which he has had the encouragement and assistance of officers of your Association—has embarked upon what I hope will be a continuing series of visits to American colleges. On these forays he meets with students as well as faculty and is able to make some Canadian contribution as well as to return to Washington with valuable additions to our body of knowledge about this great and complex nation.

It is particularly interesting for Canadians to visit your colleges, for they have no exact counterpart in our country. There were, it is true, almost within memory, a series of small colleges scattered across Canada and, as in this country, many of them owed their origins to the churches with which they remained associated. For a variety of reasons, not the least of them financial, most of these early colleges became wholly or partly autonomous elements in the federations from which many of our universities grew. So that a college in Canadian parlance is likely to compare more closely to the English college and, whether or not it retains any ecclesiastical connection, to form part of a larger institution. Nevertheless there is a good deal of common ground between the Canadian university and the American liberal arts college. This is particularly evident in the emphasis on undergraduate instruction and in the time devoted to the students by members of the faculty, both in formal instruction and in the many clubs, groups and individual contacts which complement the work of the lecture room.

It is however with very scanty experience of the institutions whose learned heads are now around me that I have the effrontery to address you on "The College and the Community." My defence is that there may possibly be some element of novelty in the observations of one who is a foreigner yet not quite foreign. In any event your invitation has given me the opportunity of reflecting once more upon a subject of perpetual fascination and, in my view, transcendent importance irrespective of national

boundaries—the relationship of higher education to national and international life.

In each of the colleges that I have visited in this country I have encountered a marked flavour of community. This of course is in the great tradition which began with the societies of scholars in the Middle Ages. Despite the changes which the centuries have wrought, one still seems to detect the repetition of this theme of community so characteristic of the religious origins of many of your foundations.

Doubtless this impression of community derives in part too from physical characteristics. More often than not, I suppose, the American college constitutes a kind of academic island—whether the sea which connects it with the outside world be rural or urban—an island on which the inhabitants, young and older, share a largely corporate existence. But should I be wholly mistaken in concluding that the sense of community derives essentially from something less tangible—from some element of group devotion in which, in greater or less degree, all members of the society participate? Perhaps—though I do not think so—I have yielded to the temptation of finding among you what I sought—communities retaining some attachment to the classical disciplines, still informed and inspired by the great humanistic and religious traditions, dedicated to the development of the whole man.

This at any rate as I understand it, is the heritage of the American liberal arts college. It is this that has given it its distinctive character. And it is, I firmly believe, by the preservation and development of this great tradition that the institutions which make up your Association can make their greatest contribution not only within your own communities but also to your nation and to the world.

I have not concealed the high value I believe should be attached to the college as a community. But the academic community can have no full meaning within itself. For the most part it is true that the gibe of “the ivory tower” displays only ignorance of the wider role that institutions of higher education have played from the Middle Ages to our own day. But, when the essential connection with the world outside has been neglected or abused—on either side—colleges and universities

have failed to fulfill their essential function and discharge their sacred responsibility to the broader community.

There are of course a number of ways in which the college is related to the larger community of the nation. Let us consider only two. In the first place the college is in itself a unique organism. It stands at once for continuity and change. The continuity is represented by tradition and by organization—by “constitution,” if you will—and happily, within the limits of human frailty, by the faculty. Into and through this continuing organism flows a constant stream of new blood. It is one of the essentials of the true academic society that it should combine respect for the knowledge handed down to it with a willingness to see the world afresh as it comes under the microscope. For a college is after all a place of learning and of advanced study. And all its members, the teachers and the taught, should constantly be exploring, judging and reappraising the facts and the theories, the phenomena and the philosophies of the present as well as the past.

The relationship of the academic society to the world about it is not a simple or an easy one. Unless it is to abandon its own peculiar character and lose its virtue, the college must not permit itself to be unduly influenced by passing fashion and contemporary opinion. This would be to surrender its trust for continuity and balanced judgment. On the other hand, if it is to discharge its social purpose it must be receptive to new ideas and responsive to new demands from the larger community outside itself.

With this audience it would be presumptuous of me to run over the familiar ground of freedom of thought and speech. The enunciation of the principle causes no great difficulty, but the issue is often complex and, it seems to me that freedom is sometimes fought for on doubtful ground. It is well to remember too that our freedoms may be as gravely threatened by popular passion as by pressure from constituted authority. The college may be the object of mob criticism, just as once it was the object of mob violence.

At times colleges and universities have failed to conserve the best traditions of a nation and have succumbed to current political domination. We are all familiar with the tragedy of Ger-

man universities during the Third Reich. Where once even the most illiberal governments of the German states had refrained from interference, where formerly there had been a quite remarkable respect for education unhampered by the demands of passing regimes, there came collapse and surrender. This does not in German history suggest any necessary conflict between the universities and the state. Indeed, it was to a considerable extent in the German universities that Prussia found a philosophy of recovery after its humiliating defeats at the hand of Napoleon.

Nowadays the degree of financial reliance of our universities and colleges upon local and national governments varies greatly. But in Canada as in this country this is an increasingly important fact of academic life, and necessarily so. Here again—without imputing any sinister motive—there is a danger to independence. The same may be true where there are large individual or group benefactions. The cultivation of an artificial spirit of radicalism is unlikely to maintain the balance. What is needed, it seems to me, is that comparative detachment which allows for the basic independence of thought on which progress in the proper sense depends.

Let me turn now to a second aspect of the college's relationship to the larger community—the preparation of men and women to take their places in organized society. Within this wide field I shall touch upon only one phase where I have some personal experience—the education of those who will find their future in the service of public authority.

In recent years, the immense extension of the functions of the state—a process which has characterized free governments almost as much as “the people's democracies”—has required that large numbers of our citizens should be in the direct employ of the state. Peoples everywhere have demanded that their governments provide a great variety of services which our fathers regarded as the responsibility partly of the individual and partly of Providence.

I am referring not only to the great social programmes but also to the many other immensely varied services which modern governments are expected to provide. These now range over almost the whole horizon of human endeavour and in all coun-

tries call for great armies of public servants. In general, I judge, it will not be in the many expert fields that your colleges can assist in meeting these immense requirements. What they can do, however, is to keep before their young men and women the possibility of careers in public employment. More than that, they can provide that general training of the mind and instill those standards of private and public duty without which no public service can discharge its vast responsibilities.

Of the great importance in a free country—particularly at this time—of a public service of high quality and high standard, I am increasingly persuaded. The failure of an inefficient or negligent public servant can rarely perhaps be measured in terms of human lives in the same sense as that of an incompetent or cowardly commander in the field. But history, and indeed the world around us today, afford some dramatic examples of what a good and what a bad public service can accomplish. A proud constitution, studded with declarations of human rights and civil liberties, is no sure barrier against corruption, subversion or even the violent overthrow of the state. Indeed no single factor—neither the law, nor political traditions, nor even the character of a nation—is alone sufficient to guarantee stability, order and justice. But an independent, honest and devoted public service is one of the proven bulwarks of continuity and freedom.

More important to the future servant of the state than any courses in government or public administration—however admirable these may be—are the basic elements of a liberal education. I know that in recent months the authorities in this country, and in my own, have voiced their grave anxiety at the inadequacy of the numbers of trained men and women coming forward to meet the constantly mounting demands of applied science and technology. Nor am I disposed to doubt that, in the intensified competitive co-existence to which the free world seems now indefinitely committed, the need is urgent and the shortage critical. Nevertheless I cannot but believe that at no period in history has there been greater need, in and out of the public service, for what Macaulay called the “general intelligence”—that is to say a sense of proportion and historical perspective, awareness of social and moral values. And it seems to

me that it is precisely these elements which, by inclination and tradition, institutions like those represented here are best qualified to impart.

If tonight I have seemed to be concentrating my thoughts within the limits of the local and the national society, it is certainly not because I am not conscious of the pressing need for us to lift our eyes and minds above and beyond national boundaries. In partnership with other national communities which share our attachment to the same essential purposes for which your colleges were founded, your country and mine are engaged in a fateful struggle to maintain and extend the frontiers of freedom. Arrayed against us are powerful and cynical forces which deny and threaten our most cherished principles. Our defence is not to be found alone in megaton weapons and supersonic flight but in the informed judgment of our minds and the vitality of our faith. It is here essentially that the value of the free college is to be found. It is here essentially that the free college finds its basic justification. It is here that the free college communities of America have a great and healing contribution to bring to the larger communities of the nation and of mankind.

LIBERAL ARTS: THE YEARS AHEAD

HEROLD C. HUNT

UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

NOT least of the pleasurable aspects of my Washington assignment is an opportunity to view daily some of the great monuments and buildings of our Nation's Capital—memorials raised to the great personages of American history, and public buildings designed to exemplify the finer traits of our national character. Though Government service, I confess, allows little time for more than passing sightseeing, I find it a thrilling experience simply to view the impressive structures which house our Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art, for they symbolize to me the ever-broadening, ever-deepening richness of our national culture.

Among these symbols of our heritage is the Archives Building, with its massive human figures—the work of Robert Aiken—looking backward on the one hand and forward on the other. The inscription beneath the figure of the man looking backward, you will recall, is the admonition by Confucius to “Study the Past”; while carved in the stone base of the figure of a woman looking forward is the Shakespearean observation: “What is Past is Prologue.” Appropriately the month of January, named after the two-faced Roman god Janus, suggests as well the backward and the forward view.

I should like today briefly to “Study the Past” of American higher education, on the very assumption that “What is Past is Prologue.” And in so doing I should like to say that the emergence of the Association of American Colleges some 40 years ago is an important landmark of our educational history; a landmark made the more prominent by the subsequent work of this Association toward “the promotion of higher education in all its forms. . . .” It is with some hesitancy that I approach the task of interpreting history to an audience which has played such a large part in writing it, or of looking into a future which will be largely of your making. I have however the temerity to discuss the future of our liberal arts here because I know this audience is too liberally educated to be misled by any errors I may commit in this brief discussion.

This is the time, I am convinced, for all of us who value the liberal arts as the keystone of our system of higher education to bring into the area of educational debate the future of these studies we call the liberal arts. For as we read the history of higher education we find a story of change in response to cultural change, and as we contemplate the impact of recent developments upon our culture there appears ahead a period in which higher education will be under intense pressure to alter its form and substance still further.

To suggest briefly and simply what I mean by impending cultural change, let me share with you an intriguing prognosis by General David Sarnoff, who is in a better position than most of us to see the future of our material progress:

The very fact that electronics and atomics are unfolding simultaneously is a portent of the amazing changes ahead. Never before have two such mighty forces been unleashed at the same time. Together they are certain to dwarf the industrial revolutions brought about by steam and electricity. There is no element of material progress we know today—in the biological and chemical fields, in atomics and electronics, in engineering and physics—that will not seem, from the vantage point of 1980, a fumbling prelude.

When we consider what industrial developments of the 19th Century meant to education—in terms of expanded facilities, new institutions, curriculum change and interest in education—we may well wonder at the educational implications of a century of development destined to dwarf these earlier changes. The combined aspects of population growth, economic expansion and increased leisure are potentially sufficient to alter our educational system beyond recognition.

What of the liberal arts in such an atmosphere of change? Are they to survive? Are they to stand, steadfastly resisting change? Or are they to respond to the massive pressure of the cultural shift? It is here that I should like to turn to our past experience for some clue as to what we may expect to see in the exciting quarter or half century ahead.

The answer of history, I would maintain, is that our liberal arts have changed in form to a considerable extent, as a result of changes in the large American culture. The old classical curriculum—the Trivium and the Quadrivium—were for long years

the *artes liberales*; but some years before the Yale Report of 1828—that classic defense of the classics—there were signs that the demands of a new republic and a growing nationalism would call forth a modification of that curriculum. Thomas Jefferson, whose unconcealed love for the classics is known to all, established within the classic walls of his University a curriculum which included law, political economy and other courses then *infra dig* in academic circles. His reasons were clear and well expressed.

He wrote in 1814 that he had examined carefully the curricula of existing institutions of higher learning throughout the world and had developed the “conviction that no one of them, if adopted without change, would be suited to the circumstances and pursuits of our country. The example they have set, then, is authority for us to select from their different institutions the materials which are good *for us*, and, with them, to erect a structure, whose arrangement shall correspond with our own social condition. . . .”

The thesis that the American collegiate curriculum has undergone mutation as a result of changes in cultural environment is endorsed by myriad other illustrations from educational history. There is no need to enumerate these for an audience which knows them well, but I should like to remind you of the procession of new collegiate courses which found their way into our curricula in the 19th Century and have won the stamp of academic respectability subsequently: the natural sciences, the physical sciences, modern history, English literature, engineering, the fine arts and the social sciences. Some of these have earned the title of liberal arts, some have not; but all have won a deserved place in our colleges and universities.

This change has taken place slowly, and it has taken place despite an understandable reluctance on the part of many educators. President Francis Wayland of Brown University observed in 1857 that there existed a tendency on the part of new institutions in the West to look to the established colleges of the East as models for their imitation, much as these same colonial colleges looked eastward across the Atlantic for their inspiration. It will serve to suggest the almost slavish academic fashion of the first half of the 19th Century if you will recall that, when Allegheny College was founded in the then wilderness of Western

Pennsylvania, its founders dutifully placed in the cornerstone a piece of mortar from Virgil's tomb and a chip off Plymouth Rock! And we may mark the change in emphasis in the college curriculum by this quotation from the *Cincinnati Western Review* of 1820:

Should the time ever come when Latin and Greek should be banished from our universities and the study of Cicero and Demosthenes, of Homer and Virgil should be considered as unnecessary for the formation of a scholar, we should regard mankind as fast sinking into absolute barbarism, and the gloom of mental darkness as likely to increase until it should become universal.

It can be said, I think, that the American definition of liberal arts as *certain courses of study* has been materially affected by cultural developments. Certainly these disciplines have had to share their eminence with other worthy studies more in demand by a public which responded to change. The proportion of college students who pursue studies in the liberal arts—narrowly defined—has surely declined.

It was President Eliot of Harvard who led the 19th-century movement away from the fixed definition of the liberal arts curriculum, with the charge that the older, established, disciplinary program of studies stood for "one primer, one catechism, one rod"! But he was only one of hundreds of prominent educational leaders who felt that education was under obligation to adapt itself to changing circumstances—only one of many who felt that liberal education had to be defined (at least partially) in terms of a modern world. As Abraham Flexner has said more recently, "A modern university differs . . . mainly because new activities and problems have become objects of intellectual curiosity and social importance [and these] demand the attention of scholars and scientists."

In this new year of 1956 then we may well ask ourselves, in the light of impending developments, whether or not we must expect to surrender some of our established concepts of training in the coming decades. All of us here share a sense of devotion to what we call the "traditional disciplines," for they have long seemed to us to be the very lifeblood of our colleges and universities. The prospect of their passing would be the cause of justifiable alarm.

We can take heart from our history rather than alarm, for I am convinced that throughout more than a century of curricular upheaval and change we have never lost sight of the precious *essence* of liberal training. We have on the contrary learned that the spirit of what we call liberal arts has survived in areas we had thought lost and has flourished in curricula we had presumed barren. We have learned that the *genius* of liberal studies is not to be mistaken for the form they take or the name they bear.

Our experience has taught us to search for a liberally educated man where we find him, rather than where we might expect to find him. We have been forcefully reminded by a multitude of uniquely American experiences that the growth and development of broad human understanding and wisdom is not the obvious product of a single course of action or study. We are too familiar with the oft-told tale of Lincoln's search for knowledge in the frontier community of his boyhood, and with Herman Melville's proud claim that "A whaling ship was my Yale College and my Harvard Yard," to believe that there is one high road to wisdom.

Recent American educational experience has led us to see that the magic of the liberal arts is both real and elusive. We have discovered that man can be led out of the depths of ignorance and prejudice and limited perspective as well through the study of plant life as through the study of the Roman wars; we have learned that the summit of understanding can be seen through the lens of microscope and telescope as well as through the traditional lens of the reading glass.

In short, in discovering that the spirit of the liberal arts survives destruction or change of the raiment in which that spirit has been clad, we have learned the great strength of the liberal arts. Where we might have feared a setback in the struggle to liberate the mind of man, we have won a major victory, because we have found an arsenal of new weapons at our command. We have learned that if some who study Latin are not liberally educated, or if some who study engineering are, it is not Latin or engineering that is responsible but a process which can be employed or omitted in the teaching of either.

Our task then is to use the honorable word liberal more as an

adverb and less as an adjective; to think in terms of educating *liberally*, because that phrase connotes active and constructive use of a precious approach rather than unimaginative worship of a traditional concept.

The fact that we have interpreted the liberal arts for the modern world is, I believe, the source of the great strength of liberal learning today. It is difficult to imagine that, if we had clung to a fixed concept of what we call the liberal arts, they would enjoy the position of respect they now claim. Had the liberal arts, through stubborn pride, clung to the forms and titles once so much a part of their tradition, they would have disappeared as a vital force in our society, just as the proud empires and monarchies have fallen which first sponsored these very studies. As it is, however, we have recently seen the Nation's liberal arts institutions selected as chief beneficiaries of the boldest and most generous stroke of philanthropy in the history of mankind. We need only note that financial contributions to education from the Nation's business and industrial corporations have doubled since 1950 to demonstrate the enviable regard in which our educational institutions are held by a modern society. And increasingly, the leaders of business, industry, government and all walks of life, look to our institutions for *liberally educated* men and women with the perspective and vision which will make them creators of a better world rather than precision parts in an existing world.

The implications for education of future growth and cultural change are well known to you. You are all working, individually and jointly, to prepare your institutions for the day when the flood tides of our population break over the walls of our colleges and universities. Your nights, I suspect, are filled with nightmares of faculty and space shortages, of threatened academic standards and of empty treasuries. But at the risk of further disturbing your sleep, let me remind you that our grand tradition of the liberal arts must also anticipate an immense challenge in the years immediately ahead.

Increased emphasis upon material growth in this country will offer an unparalleled opportunity for liberal arts, but it will also offer a threat, if I am correct in believing that a growing materialism is a threat to those spiritual and intellectual values so

intimately associated with liberal learning. The promised increase in leisure time which seems to lie in our future offers an extraordinary opportunity for educators, but shall we have imagination enough and determination enough to capture a part of that resource for our liberal arts? Or shall we let it go by default to titillating but unproductive recreation and amusement? A great expansion of national wealth appears now to be a certainty. Shall we simply spend more on trivialities, or shall we lay convincing claim to some of this for the improvement of men's minds?

Many believe that education in general and the liberal arts in particular are worthy claimants upon any such increase of material resources, but will a changing world agree? What steps can be taken to ensure that learning shall win its fair share of the material prize it has so clearly helped to win?

My answer would be that liberal learning will have the material as well as the spiritual support of our society only so long as it remains a vital and beneficial force in society. We cannot simply point with pride to our extraordinary record of contribution to the advancement of mankind. Above all, we cannot permit our pattern of liberal arts to assume the role of a sacred cow. We must adapt our educational methods and our curriculum to the needs of our society, just as positively and just as confidently as Thomas Jefferson did. We must demonstrate in a totally convincing manner that what we call liberal arts are the arts by which men learn to improve themselves and their fellows—in any culture and at any time.

To do this requires a clear recognition of this single fact: that our concept of liberal arts must itself be dynamic, not static.

As we move into an era of exciting and sometimes frightening change, with our common devotion to the cause of preserving and strengthening the liberal arts, let us not strive to preserve the mere shell of the liberal arts, but rather let us devote our considerable energies to the task of sustaining the undeniably vital *essence* of these arts.

To return once more to General Sarnoff's forward look, let me relay to you his further conviction that:

The demands for mental competence will be vastly enlarged.
... Leisure, of course, will be greatly extended. A much

shorter work week will no doubt prevail in 1980, and another 10 or 15 years will have been added to the average life span. . . . Not labor but leisure will be the great problem in the decades ahead. That prospect should be accepted as a God-given opportunity to add dimensions of enjoyment and grace to life . . . the material triumphs now at our disposal and the greater ones to come must be translated into a happier life for mankind everywhere.

"To add dimensions of enjoyment and grace to life." What a succinct statement of the unparalleled challenge which faces the liberal arts in the years ahead! Do we not have at hand an opportunity to provide mankind with the means of lasting personal satisfaction—the kind of happiness that comes of fruitful living? Can we not give to our people an opportunity to lead lives which have the qualities of perspective, balance, proportion and form—which are summed up in the word "grace"?

I believe we have. I believe also that we have the resources, the leadership and the understanding to do so. Armed with a dynamic conception of the meaning and significance of the liberal arts, we can and will add "dimensions of enjoyment and grace" to the lives of generations to come.

DO WE BELIEVE IN EDUCATION?

GOODRICH C. WHITE

PRESIDENT, EMORY UNIVERSITY

THE "we" of the question may be all-inclusive, meaning the American people. Or it may be limited just to you and me, as college presidents, judged by our activities as well as by our pronouncements.

The question is for me an honest one, not merely rhetorical but real. It is a question to which I am forced back by almost every specific question encountered in making decisions or in appraising the current scene, in the perspective of past experience or in the light of the predicted future.

It is a college public relations officer, currently president of the national organization of such officers, who said recently in an address as yet unpublished:

It seems to me grimly possible that, by 1975, we may have an educational system in this country which glows with neon and glitters with chrome, schools and colleges with physical plants which might be the envy of Kubla Khan, and student bodies the size of small cities—that we may indeed have, beyond our wildest dreams, the *form* of education, *without the slightest real substance*. And what frightens me is that the educators whose judgment I respect most tell me there is no easy answer to the question of how, not simply to get youngsters into educational institutions . . . that's relatively simple . . . but to get them really *educated*.

He is "frightened" about the nature, the quality, of what will in 1975 be provided in the name of education. Perhaps as college presidents we do not need to be frightened. But we should, I think, be deeply concerned for what may happen, for what is happening, to education.

It is a graduate dean who, again in an unpublished address, views the prospective "tidal wave" of students not as the greatest opportunity but as the greatest threat yet faced by American higher education.

Whatever else the deluge of students brings, he says, we may rely on one thing with great assurance: if the word *trend* is associated with any proposal, it will immediately

enjoy approbation. This word has become the charm word in American education, and I am afraid in American life.

Basic questions are becoming obsolete. Do we ask: Is this proposal or this program educationally sound? Does it involve concepts of true values? Is it designed really to improve mankind or merely to change his environment? Is it a program of genuine quality, involving high standards? I submit that in many quarters these questions have disappeared.

Have we become in the academic world too complacent about the major issues?

These voices are raising questions to which too many of us in the midst of the daily pressures of "practical" demands give, I fear, too little heed. We must plan for the future. This means that we must build more buildings and get more money. We must get "our share" of the mounting numbers of college-age boys and girls. We must be ready to "take care" of them. Thus our survival and the balancing of our budgets will be assured. We can't be bothered now—we haven't time—with questions about the kind of education we'll be providing 10 years hence, or 25.

These colleagues whom I have quoted are looking ahead—and they are apprehensive. I have reached a point from which looking backward is somewhat easier than looking forward. But I permit myself now only a hurried glance back and a single resulting question. And I find myself wondering what we college presidents would have been doing during the past 10 years if there had been no G. I. Bill, no inflationary spiral and no crop of war-babies, with the postwar crop showing no signs of diminution. Should we have had more time for the "major issues"?

We have of course made speeches in such smoothly polished phrases as we could command—at commencement time, at the all too frequent inductions of new recruits into the ranks of college presidents and on other ceremonial occasions, as well as to alumni groups and civic clubs. Such speeches must be pleasing to the hearers if we can make them so. They must not offend. They must be professions of idealism and of faith: faith in education, in American democracy, in continuing prosperity, in world brotherhood and in peace. There can be in them little of the critical, little of tough-minded recognition of unresolved issues, little of anxious concern over dubious or threatening "trends."

Once such speeches are made we have to get about our business. We have to become "practical" men. And, whether we qualify as such or not, the questions we confront daily are practical questions; the answers must satisfy our eminently practical trustees and benefactors, alumni and patrons. In the midst of such pressures it is not surprising that many of us in practice, if not in intent, forget that our business is education, forget that thinking—and thinking hard—about education should be a major part of the college president's obligations.

Do we believe in education? Of course we do—as a people and as an assembly of college presidents. The answer is easy. Are we not greatly concerned to provide educational opportunity for all? Are we not almost frantically seeking ways and means to insure that the rising generation will have in full measure the advantages of schooling—schooling extended beyond adolescence into the years of adulthood, of marriage and of parenthood; schooling provided at no cost, or at little cost, to all who, for any reason whatsoever or for no reason at all except that it is the thing to do, choose to call upon us; schooling that seeks to meet every public demand and every conceivable individual need, real or imagined, permanent or transitory?

Of course the answer is yes. But there is a significant verbal shift in what I have just said: "schooling" is substituted for "education." The answer may not be quite so pat and obvious when the emphasis in my question is shifted. Do we believe in *education*?

I am not so sure of the answer. For it raises further, vexing questions as to what we mean and as to what we should mean by education, questions to which I have no confident answer but which nonetheless trouble me. Some of these questions I venture to state as simply and directly as I can.

Are we, I ask first, trying in the name of education to do too much, allowing to be thrust upon our schools and colleges, or assuming for them, too many and too varied responsibilities, thus jeopardizing education itself in its essence?

Are we confusing long-range and highly valuable results of education with its direct objectives, thus jeopardizing both education and its ultimate outcomes?

Are we allowing the anti-intellectualism which troubles us so

much in other areas of our common life actually to dominate our thought about education and to determine our planning for the schools of the future, thus again jeopardizing education in its essential and its distinctive meaning?

Are we forgetting the individual, the person and his private living, in our emphasis upon public service and the obligations of citizenship, thus jeopardizing the qualities that in their essence should mark the educated man, whatever his vocation or his role in the life of the community of which he is a member?

Are we so concerned about contemporary, which must mean temporary, problems that now beset us as a people that we jeopardize the education that will fit the rising generation to deal with the unforeseen and the unforeseeable problems of 1975—or 1999?

Are we wasting time and money, delaying the attainment of intellectual maturity, actually encouraging slovenly habits of work and stifling intellectual curiosity by unduly prolonging the period of “going to school,” with a maximum of duplication and repetition and a minimum of coherence, coordination and continuity?

Is the time coming when the taxpayer and the philanthropist will begin to ask why he should pay for “college experience” for every youngster who wants to go, irrespective of why he goes, how long he stays or what he actually gets? Shall we be asked insistently why we take in so many and graduate so few of the many? And will the questioner be satisfied, or should we be satisfied, with “adapting” the curriculum so that all can graduate? Will not education then lose all significance? Would it not be simpler—and cheaper—just to confer the bachelor’s degree on all who apply at a given age and have managed to stay out of jail? Granting that this is a *reductio ad absurdum*, there are “trends” nonetheless which justify the question. What does the bachelor’s degree mean anyway?

It is obvious that these questions are interrelated, each almost inescapably implying the others. It is obvious too that they imply grave misgivings about some current trends, some current thinking and much of current practice. They are not new questions: they are variations, in terms of the current scene, of questions that have been at issue perhaps through the centuries and vigorously so in the two centuries within which (though not

through which) some of us here have lived. Abler and wiser men than I have raised and are now raising them. They are questions which in one form or another will persist during the next quarter of a century. Perhaps even 1980 will not have provided final answers, though surely it will be clear by then where current trends have led.

There are other voices expressive of deeply thoughtful and searching concern, though not always raised from academic halls.

It is a thoughtful editor, in a sense the voice of business, who ventures to question the assumption that "leaders and thinkers (will) be developed by sending to college young men and women who have no interest in learning." "It escapes us," he continues, "how a leader is likely to be developed from a young man who goes to college, has a high old time for four years and manages to pass by the skin of his teeth sufficient cinch courses to give him a diploma . . . the courses of a great many colleges—by no means all (and one is glad that he can put in that reservation)—have been adjusted to those minds least capable of being educated."

The editorial concludes with the almost casual observation that "a college degree and education are not synonymous." You and I know this. I am not sure that we are sufficiently troubled by it. We have probably been only irritated when a former university president who has consistently spoken with "no friendly voice" has said more vigorously: "Graduation from an American university is no guarantee of literacy."

"Why Johnny can't read" has been in recent months the subject of vigorous and at times ill-tempered debate. Should not we of the colleges be even more concerned as to why John, grown-up, *doesn't* read, even though he holds a bachelor's degree from a "fully accredited" liberal arts college or possibly from an admittedly "great" university? Often this college graduate is constrained to admit—or to boast—that he has not read a book in years. He sometimes feels it incumbent upon him to disavow any interest that might mark him as a "highbrow" or even perhaps an "egghead." He must pose as a roughneck—else he would be suspect among his fellows. His must be the "mucker pose" about which James Truslow Adams discoursed a good many years ago.

For me the most distressing failure of our colleges lies in the fact that in all too many of our graduates we have not established any enduring, insistent, unquenchable intellectual interests which will insure continuing growth despite all the odds. A formal education that *ends* with the acceptance of a degree with "all the rights, privileges and responsibilities thereunto appertaining" is no education at all. Liberal education can *begin* in college, but if what the college has begun does not continue throughout life it is neither education nor liberal.

"Liberal" education. This is the first time I have used this combination of words, though it appears in the general theme of this meeting. Of course it is liberal education about which I am raising questions. For me, liberal education is education in its essence. I do not need always to use the adjective. Perhaps it is significant, however, if not disturbing, that of recent years we have been inclined to be wary of the adjective. We have favored the discussion of "general" education. General education is properly contrasted with specialized education. But "general education" has often been interpreted, and in high-level reports, as liberal education "democratized." In such interpretations there is to be found not alone by implication but in overt expression the conviction that liberal education is in its intent objectionably aristocratic; that it has been provided only for "young gentlemen born to the purple," who are able to concern themselves with "appreciation of the good life"; that there must now be substituted for it an education that cultivates, directly and effectively, an appreciation of the advantages and the responsibilities of American citizenship.

Are we not rightly concerned with the good life? Is such concern offensively aristocratic? It should of course involve concern for *all* who are capable of sharing in it. I have often gone from meetings like this one and found myself wondering what the things we were discussing had to do with the lives of the soda-jerk, the bellhop, the girl behind the shop counter, the taxi driver or the hurrying crowds on the street outside. Perhaps what we talk about should have more to do with their lives. But does this mean that we should lessen our concern for those who are capable of sharing in the good life in its higher reaches and who might conceivably contribute something more of good-

ness to the lives of those less favored? Must we be content with less than the best for those capable of profiting by it in order to adapt our schools to the capacities and the needs of the greater number? Should we not thereby, in the long run, jeopardize the very existence of the civilization we seek to foster?

Here, I think, we face the basic problem of American education. How can we reconcile, without sacrificing either, the democratic ideal of schooling for all with the ideal of excellence for those capable of attaining it? There is no easy answer to such a question. But we should not forget that the question is real and persistent. We should be deeply concerned to find the answer in theory and in practice.

Hear this from the morning paper: "By expanding its investment in educating and training its people the United States can raise its skill level and thereby accelerate economic progress and contribute to national security." Probably, but are these the primary concerns of education? Surely no one can question the desirability of higher "skill level," or of accelerated economic progress, or of national security. But would we abandon education if it guaranteed none of these things? Can we not properly think of education as ministering to man's need as man, quite apart from its contribution to the national economy and to national defense.

Why does a small liberal arts college feel it necessary to list in its promotional literature 67 different vocations for which its curriculum offers preparation? And why only 67? I am told that there are 24,288 different occupations listed by the United States Department of Labor. Why omit any of them?

There has been much concern of late over the current and prospective shortage of scientists. The concern is proper. But it is justifiable not alone because we are fearful that we shall lag behind Russia in science and the resulting technology. We should need scientists in the future if there were no Russia, if there were no threat anywhere to the peace of the world. We should need science in our colleges, not alone for the production of more scientists, but because science is one of the great adventures of the human mind and spirit, one of the humanities, as Laurence Gould and I. I. Rabi have recently insisted.

The same editor whom I quoted earlier said in a later essay

that he was "vaguely disturbed" over the objectives of education as defined in the published report of a recent high-level conference. Recognizing that these may have been intended as "gentle platitudes with which every one can agree," he goes on to confess himself unable to "escape the feeling that if this is the common view of all that education is supposed to do, then the future of education does not shine very brightly." Note this, remembering that this is no pedantic professor speaking but the editor of what can rightly be thought of as a journal of conservative business interests:

It is our feeling that teachers ought not to be mere proselytizers or propagandists even for a way of life in which we devoutly believe. . . . We doubt, anyway, that an appreciation of the American heritage can be ladled out, predigested, from the professor's podium.

And this further:

More importantly, this . . . set of goals . . . could be completely achieved and yet result in a group of young people who would not be just badly educated but in fact would not be educated at all. For the one ingredient that is missing from this agenda is the one essential both to education and a true appreciation of the American heritage. . . . Nowhere among these goals will you find any emphasis on learning.

And this final word:

When in education we begin a retreat from learning then we shall have also begun a retreat from civilization.

These measured words represent no vested departmental interests, no concern for the mythical ivory tower or the equally imaginary cloistered shades, no special pleading.

For further justification from high authority for the raising of my questions, I find in my notebook a quotation from Woodrow Wilson. The words were spoken in the year of my graduation from college (a good long time ago), though I picked up the quotation from an educational journal much more recently:

I hear a great deal about character being the object of education. I take leave to believe that a man who cultivates his character consciously will cultivate nothing except what will make him intolerable to his fellow man. If your object in life is to make a fine fellow of yourself, you will not succeed, and you will not be acceptable to really fine fellows. Character . . . is a by-product. It comes, whether you will

or not, as a consequence of a life devoted to the nearest duty, and the place in which character would be cultivated, if it be a place of study, is a place where study is the object and character the by-product.

This is perhaps a paradox but it suggests a confusion that underlies much of our current effort to define the aims of education: a confusion of immediate aims with ultimate outcomes, of directly sought objectives with invaluable "by-products."

Of course this is not to discount the importance of character or of other qualities admirable in the individual and desirable for society. There may be many things just as good as education. There may be things better, more to be desired, more valuable. Some of them may be the outcome, the expression, the results of education. But that does not make them the same thing as education. Some of them may certainly be found apart from education of any formal kind. The finest characters I have known, the most interesting personalities, have been met in people who could in no valid sense be called educated. One such person works in my kitchen. For character, for unselfish life and service and for sheer charm of personality, I would match her with any educated person I have known. But—more's the pity—she does not have an education—except as life has educated her. And if we are to trust life as the great educator, why have schools? For then education becomes identical with the total process of growing up and in any formal sense loses all meaning.

We may shrink from asserting that education is an end in itself, from talking of learning for learning's sake, of intellectual interests as providing their own satisfactions and needing no justification beyond themselves. But why should we so shrink? For if education makes its possessor a finer and more completely human creature, providing for his life as a person more depth and resource, more elevation and outreach, more insight and perspective—quite apart from what he *does* as wage earner, as voter, as servant of the public weal—then surely education can be valued and sought as an end in itself. And I am persuaded that if it is so valued and sought we can be calmly confident about the ultimate outcome in life and service.

Whitehead, whom we all love to quote, has defined religion as "what one does with his solitariness." May not education too

have much to do with "what one does with his solitariness"? It should make one at least able to *endure* himself alone for some of his waking hours, so that going somewhere—anywhere—and doing something—anything—cease to be imperative necessities for living. I can not resist quoting from Marten ten Hoor's plea for "education for privacy" which he presents in *The American Scholar*. "Nobody has time these days," he says, "to improve himself, so busy is he with attempts to improve his neighbor." He expresses some skepticism "concerning the present emphasis on social-mindedness in education." Among other pregnant sentences at the end are these words: "If (one) wishes to lead his fellows, he must first learn to lead himself. Without education for privacy he will neither merit leadership nor learn to recognize it in others."

More recently the President of Harvard, in a calmly unexplosive appraisal of the "exploding world of education," recognizes that "our future educational practice must make place for large numbers," delicately balances education's function in serving society against its function in helping "individuals grow as individuals" and concludes that "a complete education has a responsibility to do more than 'serve society.' It has to save us from ourselves."

In characteristic fashion "no friendly voice" has spoken of "the trivialization of our lives" and of "the deep and permanent melancholia that underlies the American temperament (due) in part at least to the boredom that the perpetual search for amusement at length induces." And the president of a great metropolitan college, a scholar and a public servant outside academic circles as well as within, has most recently said:

The major problem for us is the conquest of vacuity through education, because vacuity is the result of leisure which technology makes possible. For the first time in history great masses of people find themselves surrounded by vast reaches of space and time; and if you do not know what to do with space, it defines itself as emptiness, and time moves into a sort of twilight shared with eternity . . . the reason why men can be so driven is the dreadful nakedness of the self in isolation when one has not encountered it previously. To find one's soul when one has not dreamed it existed may well be for many, especially those belonging to a culture

which has expressed itself so energetically in action, a quite unnerving shock.

And so the schoolboy who now turns his shining face to the future must no longer be trained merely for the tasks he is to perform. He will need the twin modes of intellectual life which are interior discipline and outgoing dialogue, because only so can he exist with a measure of happiness during the long hours when some *thing* does his *work* for him. It is not necessary for me to say where such education can find the precepts and the methods it requires. They are the legacy of the aristocratic past, which must now become the democratic future. All this, of which the Russian is not officially permitted to think, has now become that which we must have in our minds if we are to endure.

Can we not accept the dictum of the British historian who writes in a broader context: "It is not open to any of us to say that we will postpone what philosophers call 'the good life'—postpone any of the higher purposes of mankind until the world is more happily placed or the environment more congenial"? May we not heed the words of the American critic and essayist who pleads for unceasing concern, whatever arduous tasks may rightly lie ahead, whatever emergency may develop, for all that reminds us of "what is enduring in man, of his potentialities and dignity as an individual, and of what is mightiest, best or most human in his thinking, his aspirations, his sufferings . . . whatever gives proof that man lives by other laws and other impulses than those of the jungle"?

To utterances of this kind I find myself peculiarly responsive, perhaps because of a persisting sense of deficiency in my own education; perhaps chiefly because of weariness with insistent demands for the support of many worthy causes, even through their intrusion into the curriculum—causes which however good in themselves seem to have little relationship to education. Whatever the reason, I can find much of encouragement and much of challenge in the midst of the welter and the confusion and the conflict of today's discussion of education.

As we look ahead I am sure that, instead of relying on the coming "tidal wave" to carry us to safety from the reefs of depression and deficits and thus insure our survival, instead of being eagerly concerned that we get "our share" of the mounting numbers, some of us must (as some have done already) delimit

our areas of service and resist pressures to do many wholly commendable things—not out of indifference to public demand or demonstrable need, not with self-satisfied parade of superiority, but out of deep concern for and firm commitment to education. Many of us, if we are actually to survive and serve, must leave to others many types of service, not because we question their value but because we simply cannot do these things without the sacrifice of what we conceive to be our educational job.

I said earlier that I sometimes wondered what we should have been doing if we had not as administrators been confronted by a series of crises.

If I were facing the prospect of another decade or so as a college president I would set myself with resolute determination to guard some time for thinking about my job: not in terms of budgets and buildings and burgeoning student bodies, of promotion and propaganda and public relations, but in terms of what education really is or ought to be—what we are trying to do, what we ought to be trying to do, how well we are doing it and how we might do it better. I should want to dig beneath the surface and, with all the help I could get from those abler and wiser than I, examine critically and searchingly the assumptions underlying our feverish activities.

I should want to spend perhaps a little less time with fundraising and publicity experts, investment counselors, statisticians and business analysts, architects and engineers. For such counselors and guides I have, in all honesty, the highest regard. We could not do without them. Many of them see the deeper issues of education in clearer perspective than do some of us who are called “educators.” The more completely I have been able to leave to them the matters in which they are expert, the better have I succeeded as an administrator. But I have needed more than they could give. And I have not found time to seek this “more” from those sources which alone could provide it. So I should want to live a bit more with the philosophers and the poets and the artists.

For those who *will* be college presidents during the next ten years—for you and your successors—I could wish for nothing more earnestly than opportunity, time and the will so to busy yourselves—not only in mass meetings or in large, generously

financed and superbly organized conferences, but as well and more importantly in hours of quiet reading and meditation and in like hours of unhurried talk with selected friends who might, even against one's will, force the facing of difficult questions and the critical scrutiny of unexamined ideas. This alone would be adequate response to the challenge of the distinguished philosopher, once at Princeton and at Yale, now at Scripps: "We must first of all . . . reexamine and reassess the nature and objectives of liberal education *far* more radically than heretofore. A superficial tinkering with the surface pattern of liberal education will not suffice." "What," he asks, "must be our own honest self-appraisal when we analyze and assess ourselves in (the) spirit of ruthless self-criticism?"

Such radical reassessment, such honest self-appraisal, such ruthless self-criticism, must mark the next decade—if we believe in education.

THE GARDEN AND THE GROVE

THEODORE A. GILL

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR, *The Christian Century*

THERE have been times and there are still places where this afternoon's session would come as the comic relief in this conference schedule. The idea that the Christian Church should have anything positive to say about *liberal* education will always look like a joke to those emancipated minds that can never disengage themselves from ancient offense. Once upon a time, when the church claimed the whole say about everything, she did limit the scholars and prescribe their conclusions. The regimentation and restriction was so outrageous to liberal academicians that some of them went into profound shock from which even now their entranced successors have hardly emerged.

But once-burned, twice-cautious liberal educators are not the only ones who will wonder how seriously to take any conversation between the church and the leaders of liberal education. Some churchmen's ears will still be ringing with the sound of fury engendered by the church's demand that liberal education become liberal enough to give the Christian claim and Christian history their appropriate place in all the academic disciplines. To some otherwise liberal educators that appropriate place was far, far outside the educational process. Their educational theory, so wide-open to everything else, slammed shut at that. The liberal label, alas, was the only thing mangled in that slamming.

But even that fight is on its way to being won. Not everybody is happy, of course, but one way or another the church is getting its innings in many educational leagues where it had long been shut out. Christian educators will be cautious about taking credit though, and will be even more wary about claiming the conversion of their erstwhile opponents. Other pressures have probably been operating: some persuasive regents and trustees may have discovered the power of positive thinking and confused that with Christianity and decided their school ought to have A Department. Carl Jung, T. S. Eliot and Arnold Toynbee are at the gates and dowdy the academicians who would bar them.

NOTE: An abstract of this address to the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Association has appeared in *The Christian Century*.

Political scientists have discovered original sin and Atheists-for-Niebuhr materialize in the inner courts. Kierkegaard and Dos-toievsky are *comme il faut* and religion is *à la mode* and Tillich is just It. So some mighty formidable walls have been breached of late, and once more Christianity is in. One must not be too sure, however, that all the defenders are yet accounted for or that all arms are laid down.

Be that as it may, the fact is that after suspicion and hostility there is now increasingly fruitful cooperation between churchman and educator in common search for truly liberal education. The Garden of Gethsemane and the Groves of Academe have not exactly merged, but they are clearly on the same map.

No one will want to rock the boat just when the sailing is getting smoother. It must still be observed however that the present arrangement is a wasteful one. It is a far better arrangement than that typified in the sealed situations of European universities in the 1400's or in Teachers College, Columbia University in the 1920's, but it is still far from efficient. Christians still are not agreed just how liberal education ought to be, and non-Christians still are not sure just how educational is any curriculum so liberal as to permit religious penetration.

The trouble is that so far the whole issue has been set as a concern for the *content* of education. Educators—remembering Galileo and Scopes—have worried about the church's telling them what their research had to discover and what their instructors had to teach. Churchmen—remembering certain vacuum-packed progressivists—have worried about getting their facts and interpretations a fair place in the scholars' and teachers' attentions. But always the concern has been about content. And the general meeting of minds which now characterizes educational discussion on this point is a qualified agreement on the content of liberal education. The results of scholarship and research shall not be predicted or prescribed by church any more than by state. And the role of Christianity shall receive full recognition in all studies where it is part of the picture. Our cordial but cautious agreement is an agreement on content.

But that doesn't even scratch the surface of what Christianity has to offer to liberal education. When it comes to facts, the Christian has no new facts to press upon educators. It insists that scholars and teachers take account of *all* the facts there are,

but Christianity has no secret store of such facts nor any private method for turning out new ones. What Christianity has to offer to education, to scholars and teachers, is a distinctive context which, if appreciated and habilitated, would show us a liberality not yet dreamed or dared.

The real difference which Protestant Christianity makes to scholarship and teaching is in the *context* it offers. Consciously Christian scholars and teachers will operate with the same facts that their uncommitted or other-committed colleagues have, but their research and their teaching will be against a different background, from a specific point of view, in a distinctive atmosphere. The context of their scholarship will be different.

Protestant Christians are not prosy people who think that when they say yes to the right creedal propositions they have the truth by the tail. Protestant Christians take creeds seriously when they think the creeds are on the trail of the truth. But the truth they claim is not literary: it is personal, relational. The truth is not a statement: it is the way things really are, how God and man and the world stand to each other, what we have to do with each other. All our statements and myths and signs and symbols are attempts to give us a picture of the way things are, what they really are and where we fit in—the context of our lives.

Would it be arch-Protestantism, or only archly Protestant, to claim that the Christian starts with *no* contents to his life prescribed? He starts with the context of his life *described*. He has, by faith, a picture of the way things really are and where he fits into the picture. He is charged with responsibility for the contents he develops within that context. We are committed to a God with a certain intention; we live in a world with certain possibilities; we have a certain relationship to that God within that world. Such is the framework, the stage, the background, the standpoint, the *context* of our living. Now we are accountable for the content. It is the setting of the Christian life, not some preworked script, which makes its configurations and conclusions different and distinctive.

So, operating within a particular view of life, the world and history, we will operate differently, distinctively, as scholars and teachers. We will look into the same things, arrive at many of the same conclusions with colleagues not oriented as we are. But the difference in our context will make a difference in the mood,

manner, range and direction of all our research and teaching. And that difference could be the most liberating ever to hit our liberal education.

Because he lives and learns in the context he affirms, the Christian scholar will have a devotion to the truth and a dedication to its pursuit which should be unique among academicians. There should be a zeal and a raptness about his research and his teaching which come directly from the framework within which he lives. He will covet truth, pursue truth, make it his own as an act of worship. For his God is the God of Truth. Every effort after every kind of truth—scientific, artistic, political, economic—is an obeisance before the God of all truth, a doing of honor before him, an act of worship. This discovering and transmitting of knowledge is not for the Christian a casual or professional or even merely interesting or agreeable endeavor; it is a part of our worship of God. It is our off-the-knees devotion.

The pursuit of knowledge, A. E. Housman tells us, is like the pursuit of righteousness: it is a part of man's duty to himself. But the Christian wants to say more. The pursuit of knowledge is a part of man's duty to God, of his devotion to God. This difference in emphasis—in context—should make appreciable practical difference in a Christian's scholarship. The character of the one to whom devotions are done must infect the devotions themselves. The integrity and the love of God will be a more significant element in the standards of our scholarship than our own integrity or love ever could be. As the late Archbishop of York observed in this connection: "A sound Christian theology insists that the love of truth is as important as the practice of truthfulness."

Again, because he lives and learns in the context he does, the Christian's scholarship will be marked by that fluidity and openness which are the chief characteristic of liberalism. Knowing his fallibility and forewarned of distortion, he will make no absolute claims for his conclusions. Instead, he will expose them to every criticism, work ceaselessly at their reconstruction. And knowing himself as the creative child of the Creator of all, he will stay dissatisfied with every accomplishment, realizing that beyond every triumph there is more possible, more expected.

Because he lives and learns in the context he does, the Christian scholar will have a vocational sense impossible to others but

richly rewarding for his research and his teaching. He will know that if his educational post uses all of him all the time, then he is called to that position, ordained to that particular job. The call of God is not often an ecstatic experience, with voices from heaven and writing on the clouds. Instead we are given certain talents, and certain opportunities come to us. Where capacities and opportunities coincide, there God is calling us, though it be with the voice of vocational guidance counselor and placement secretary. There we are mandated by God, ordained by God to his priestly service, though it be in library or laboratory or at lectern, and though the classroom be our parish. There is a grandeur about every true vocation which will add seriousness and significance to all that we do in it.

Again, the love of God is a part of the context within which the Christian scholar lives and learns. This means that for the Christian love and service, the mission of compassion, is not just a good idea of ours, nor even just a high ideal of ours: instead it is the prevailing current in the realest real. We, in our love and concern and service, ally ourselves with what is behind and beneath everything, and what outlasts all. The Christian, then, is on the lookout for need. He sees it in the college and university; he sees it in all secular studies. He sees whole departments trying to make out with their own answers to immediate questions without facing the ultimate questions about life and death. And he sees those same departments settling into cynicism or losing hold on their own subjects. This is how and when political wisdom heads toward totalitarianisms of right or left; this is how and when scientific wisdom runs downhill toward wholesale destruction; this is how and when artistic wisdom satisfies itself with its own formalities; this is how and when philosophy degenerates into definitions of definitions. No wonder some departments try to elevate their proximate answers into ultimate ones and so develop their little intradepartmental departments of religion.

This is the need which the church sees in secular studies, a need which those studies seek to satisfy for themselves at their peril. The church's concern for secular education is in part at least a concern to save it from itself. Christians are not worried about Christianity when the sciences or the arts try to extort from their own subjects the ultimate answers to ultimate ques-

tions; Christians are concerned for the sciences and arts that inevitably corrupt their essential objectivity, catholicity, impartiality when they stand pat for their own religious answers. Christians want to stay in conversation with all of education because they are sure that the truth they had to be shown can yet suggest a structure for living in which *all* our learning will receive relevance and focus and vitality and vivifying ultimate justification—along with freedom to be its own kind of learning, with its own methods and its own conclusions.

But now service is a two-way street. The church not only perceives a need in the college; the church needs the college. It is not enough to know what the ultimate context of our life is, especially when the character of that context is such that we who live in it are committed by it to witness to it, to get it across to those who are in it but do not know that they are, and at the same time to fill out the context with an immediate content of loving and concern and compassionate activity. For that, we need to know more than the Bible and the creeds and the tradition. The whole vast wisdom of the world has to be known as well, by Christians better than by anyone else. Christians should know Freud better than the Freudians, Marx better than the Marxians, Darwin better than the Darwinians, Kinsey better than he knows himself. If we do not we are left hollering down rain barrels, shouting out the wisdom of Christ with no knowledge of the world to which we shout it, no contact, no understanding. If all we know is our confession, we are left repeating the old phrases, saying the same old things, without relating them to the problems they are meant to solve and without commending them to the people they are meant to save. That is another reason why the church needs the college, and turns to it hopefully and positively. It is the wisdom of the college which can give the wisdom of the church application and relevance. Instead of sterile separation and aloofness, the Christian faith becomes alive and active in and through the world's wisdom. Through what has been called "worldly" wisdom and knowledge of the ways of the world, the wisdom of Christ enters the world, does God's work in the world and effects God's will for the world.

Finally, because he lives and learns in the context he does, the Christian scholar will be ready for that risk and resolution which makes any education liberal. Unfortunately the church has too

often given credence to the popular caricature of Christian educational policy as creeping, cautious, decrepit conservatism. How can the church be guilty of such if it takes seriously its faith in a God who has a will for the world? The Christian lives in a meaningful, purposeful world. His trust is in a God who is triumphing. This should raise the ceiling over the whole human enterprise. The cloud of doubt, the fog of ultimate dread, is dissipated for the Christian. The Christian scholar, confident that God is to be counted in on the ultimate issues of existence, can turn his undivided attention to the proximate issues which are the field of his research and teaching. The Christian faith that God is *there* in the mysterious future is a liberating faith. It frees all of us from the ultimate human dread, for the immediate fascinations of the human enterprise. More than that, since ultimate reality has declared itself in our favor, we don't have to knuckle under to anyone. We can be daring, resolute, take chances, try new tacks, thrust confidently through the whole smothering feather comforter of conformity.

The Christian context makes daring and risk available to, if not mandatory upon, the Christian scholar. I would underline that, italicize it in this day of the homogenization of men. It is the context of Christian scholarship which gives Christian scholarship whatever difference it has. Part of that difference should be the confidence which demands that we be different even when everyone else is conforming. When ultimate reality has declared itself in our favor, we do not have to knuckle under to anyone. Liberal scholarship is the least of our possibilities; radical scholarship is the natural habitat of Christians.

This then is part of the context in which Christian scholars and teachers work. It is a context in which education can be truly liberal. It is the whole case for the continuation of Christian colleges where a whole academic community can seek to realize and work within one context without qualifying academic freedoms. It is the whole case for universities' seeking out and enlisting Christian scholars for their faculties. Personally, the vision of such a context to our living and learning should chasten and chide all of us who have thought of ourselves as Christian scholars and then taught with small show of the devotion, dedication and daring which are our service of God to liberal education.

LIBERAL SCHOLARSHIP AND CHRISTIAN TRADITION

ROBERT J. HENLE

DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL, SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

I SHOULD like today to attempt to define the position of the Christian intellectual, of the Christian scholar and teacher. This is but a small part of the problem set by the subject of our discussion but it is a fundamental part.

We must locate the Christian scholar within the relationship implied in our subject. Two terms are given us, Christianity on the one hand and scholarship, the intellectual life of the university, on the other. Within the tension between these terms we shall find the place of the Christian intellectual, the man who is intellectual *qua* Christian.

Now Christianity came into the world and presented itself initially not as a culture or as a liberal education or as a system of philosophy but as a dynamic message and way of salvation. It was intended for all, the learned and the unlearned, Greek and barbarian, rich and poor—a universal gospel. It did as a matter of record contain a revelation of facts and of principles but these were to be preached, not taught in the schools of philosophy; they were first of all to be worked into the everyday living of men, not to be elaborated into a purely speculative system; they constituted primarily a way of holiness, not a mode of intellectual culture.

But Christianity, moving through all classes of Roman and Greek society, very early became the possession also of the learned and the cultured and found itself called upon to determine its position with reference to human learning and human culture. And the pagan and the secular culture of the world found itself also forced to determine its attitude towards this new thing which now appeared alongside the schools as a competitive challenge.

In dealing with this very complex problem, I shall indulge in a bit of over-simplification without, I hope, losing the essential lines of development. I shall then distinguish three traditions within this complex of relationships.

There has been within Christianity, apparently from the very beginning, an anti-intellectual tradition. We may take as the early type of this tradition the powerful writer and leader Tertullian. His condemnation of the wisdom of this world, of secular learning, is sweeping and consistent:

Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae? quid haereticis et christianis? Nostra institutio de porticu Salomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat dominum in simplicitate cordis esse querendum. Viderint qui Stoicum et Platonium et dialecticum christianismum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum nec inquisitione post evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse quod ultra credere debeamus.¹

This anti-intellectual tradition has continued throughout the history of Christianity. It appears in certain patristic writers, in some of the mediaeval Augustinians, in some of the Reformation leaders who contemned the humane learning of the Renaissance as well as the scientific and philosophical culture of the Schoolmen. And today there is still with us a sub-tradition of Christian anti-intellectualism.

This tradition can be characterized—again with a certain degree of over-simplification—by defining two theoretical points. First there is the tendency to say that revelation does not confront man with a statement of facts and principles, that it has no intellectual content, and to maintain that the act of faith is not an act of the intellect and is in no sense an act of knowledge. The act of faith is thus removed from the area of intelligence and knowledge; it becomes a blind adherence to the Divine darkness; it is in the area of value rather than of truth; it becomes entirely voluntaristic, or worse still, simply a matter of feeling and emotion.

In the second place, there is a tendency—in perhaps another direction—to say, as Tertullian did, that since revelation has given man all he needs to know for salvation, other learning is superfluous and unnecessary. Indeed from this standpoint, to seek other knowledge than that of the Scriptures and of Christian tradition is to indulge that vice of *curiositas* against which the mediaeval Augustinians warned us so solemnly. In this view

¹ *De Praescriptione haereticorum*, c. 7.

Christianity is a total and self-sufficient surrogate for human culture and learning; it is opposed to these and need have no part in them.

I have said that this tradition is still alive in the world today. Among Protestants it shows itself as a disparagement of reason, almost at times a rejection of reason, and as an effort to displace the act of faith from the intellectual level to a non-rational or even sub-rational status. Among Catholics it is currently showing itself—to use Maritain's phrase—as a sort of “theological imperialism”² in which theological knowledge is regarded as a complete substitute for other disciplines, specifically for philosophy, and the theologian is made as it were *ex officio* competent to judge matters internal to the other disciplines.

Over against this anti-intellectual sub-tradition within Christianity, we find the effort of secular learning to define its attitude in confrontation with Christian revelation. This tradition we may start with Celsus, Origen's adversary, following it through the learned pagans of the third and fourth centuries against whom Augustine wrote, finding it again in the sceptics of the 14th and 15th centuries, in the Deists of the 18th, in the materialists of the 19th and finally in the secular intellectuals of today.

This tradition also says that whatever the act of faith may be, whatever value it may have, it is not an intellectual act and its content, if any, does not belong to the order of knowledge. It belongs rather to the area of personal value preferences or of symbolic satisfaction of psychological needs. It is rather to be classified with prejudices and emotional choices than with intellectual convictions. Therefore revelation and faith not only may but must be ignored in the intellectual life and in the pursuit of knowledge. Revelation and faith are not only irrelevant; they are positive hindrances to the enterprise of scholarship.

In modern times this tradition has developed many subforms, an extreme variety of which is that called “scientism.” Those who follow this way of thinking maintain that the only kind of real knowledge we can obtain as human beings and the only possible genuine truth result from those methods which are grouped together under the rubric of “the scientific method.” In some cases, “scientific method” is used in a broad sense, but often enough it refers to methods closely modeled on or identical with

² See footnote 5.

those of the physical and biological sciences. Thus for example Professor Homer Smith asserts that the only method we have for attaining truth and knowledge is the method of science; all else is empty speculation. Thus he denies intellectual status not only to revelation and faith but to much else besides. He concludes, logically enough it seems to me: "The contemporary philosopher recognizes the essential indignity of man and his emotions."³

I would characterize this tradition and especially the sub-tradition represented by Professor Smith as anti-intellectual. In the first place, it agrees with the anti-intellectual Christian tradition in depriving the act of faith of an intellectual content and of respectability as an intellectual conviction. Moreover, there is a deeper point of agreement with the anti-intellectual Christian tradition. For the latter tradition disparages reason in that it is powerless to achieve truth, thus making way for the blind trust of faith, while the former disparages reason in that it is powerless to attain those fundamental truths about God and man which are the necessary setting for an intellectual act of faith. In Chesterton's story, *The Blue Cross*, Father Brown explains to the great French criminal Flambeau how he recognized that the criminal's clerical garb was an imposture: "You attacked reason," said Father Brown, "it's bad theology." And I would add: "It's bad epistemology."

In the second place, this tradition limits the resources of the human mind to some one sort or several sorts of methodologies. This is an anti-intellectualism of the kind referred to by Dean Charles Odegaard when speaking of the evils of over-specialization:

It [specialization] also invited a form of anti-intellectualism within the colleges and universities themselves, the anti-intellectualism of the intellectual expert who has a great respect for rational methods in the particular area which he has chosen to study but who, ignorant of the elements of rational analysis in other fields, may be contemptuous of his colleagues and anti-intellectual in the net effect of his opinions about their work.⁴

³ Homer W. Smith, "Objectives and Objectivity in Science," *The Yale Scientific Magazine*, XXIII, No. 5, February, 1949, pp. 2 and 3.

⁴ Charles E. Odegaard, "Graduate Teaching and Research in United States Universities," *Conference on Education and Student Life in the United States*, June, 1955, p. 7.

One kind or several kinds of knowing are selected as valid, all others being rejected, and "truth," "certitude," "critical mind," "evidence," etc. are all interpreted and defined within these limited methodologies. This amounts to an epistemological error of considerable proportions and gives rise, often enough today, to what Maritain has called a "scientific imperialism."⁵ The resources of the human intelligence are limited, and intelligence itself is defined as and identified with only part of its total ambit. This again is a disparagement of reason which, from the standpoint of the Christian intellectual, is both bad theology and bad epistemology.

It should be noted—though I do not intend here to argue the substantive issues involved—that the secularist rejection of faith and revelation from the sphere of knowledge and scholarship is today very largely a matter of assumptions. It is assumed that scientific methodology is alone valid, for obviously this is not a point which could in turn be established by scientific methodology. It is assumed that philosophy as distinct from science is bankrupt. It is assumed that Hume proved the impossibility of evidence for miracles and that modern science has finished off the job. It is assumed that Kant and Dewey and Logical Positivism have refuted the arguments for the existence of God. It is assumed that the Higher Criticism has destroyed the value of the Bible and that Renan's word on the subject, though now somewhat dated, is still substantially final. No doubt there are secular intellectuals who have made a thorough scholarly study of the Christian intellectual position, though I have never met any such either personally or in writings. This in no way derogates from the integrity and intelligence of our secular scholars for, historically speaking, it is quite understandable why such un-

⁵ "In the history of human knowledge we see now one, now another of these intellectual virtues, now one, now another, of these types of knowledge, trying, with a sort of imperialism, to seize, at the expense of the others, the whole universe of knowledge. Thus, at the time of Plato and Aristotle, there was a period of philosophical and metaphysical imperialism; in the Middle Ages, at least before St. Thomas Aquinas, a period of theological imperialism; since Descartes, Kant and August Comte, a period of scientific imperialism which has progressively lowered the level of reason while at the same time securing a splendid technical domination of material nature." Jacques Maritain, *The Range of Reason*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1952, p. 11.

examined assumptions should form part of their patrimony of presuppositions.

I have spoken of two traditions, one of them being the anti-intellectual Christian sub-tradition. This latter sub-tradition may at times and in certain places have been the dominant Christian mood, but if we take the long view of the Christian tradition and embrace its full history, we find that the dominant and main tradition has not been the anti-intellectual one. On the contrary, Christian humanism and Christian intellectualism have been the central, vital tradition. We may take as our first exemplar of this tradition that charming and courageous man, Saint Justin the Martyr. His own account of his conversion describes him as a wandering scholar going from philosophical school to philosophical school, looking for wisdom—for, as we might say, a real liberal education. He tells us how at last he encountered a Christian priest and, through him, found in Christianity what he had been seeking in the philosophical schools. But, having embraced Christianity, he did not reject the culture of the Greeks or the learning of the Romans. He continued to call himself a "philosopher," that is a scholar, an "intellectual." But his Christianity—by the title of truth and knowledge—became intrinsic to his scholarship, a part of his intellectual growth and work. He was a Christian scholar *qua Christian*. But by the same title of truth and knowledge he retained the culture of classical civilization; for he saw all knowledge and all truth—no matter from what source or by what methods acquired—as interrelated and intimately reducible to the Christian God Who counts among His Divine Names that of "Ipsa Veritas." This is the tradition which we can trace through the Christian schools of Alexandria and through Saint Augustine; which gave rise to the great mediaeval universities; within which Albert the Great, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Saint Thomas More, Bellarmine, Newman and the Christian intellectuals of today are to be numbered.

Of course revelation, as a message of salvation, is much more than the communication of knowledge, and the act of faith by which a man accepts revelation, as a moral and religious commitment and a grace-governed act, is much more than an act of intelligence or knowledge.⁶ But within this tradition revelation

⁶ Cf. R. J. Henle, S.J., "An Essay in Educational Theory," *The Modern Schoolman*, XXV, No. 2, January, 1948, pp. 110-11.

is seen as presenting to man's intelligence, with warrant of authenticity, facts and principles which belong to the category of knowledge; the act of faith is seen to be an act of the intellect, an increase of knowledge which, at first but dimly grasped, can be elaborated by human disciplines and human intelligence into a true intellectual discipline—theology.

In virtue of *this* aspect of revelation and faith, their elaboration takes its place within the full ambit of human intellectual culture, and theology becomes a valid and independent intellectual discipline with its own factual starting points, its own methods and its own competencies. From this standpoint the authority of the Scriptures and the Church becomes intrinsic to the intellectual enterprise for, *from this standpoint*, they are part of the validating methodology of theology and part of its initial facts, just as testimony and human witness are intrinsic to the enterprise of historical scholarship.

Now I should define the college and especially the university in terms of teaching and scholarship, that is as intellectual enterprises. This is not to deny that universities and especially colleges have additional objectives and obligations; indeed they are bound to promote character development and high moral living. But the intrinsic work of the university is intellectual and scholarly development, not moral betterment. It must provide for the development of human intellectual culture in its fullest ambit. What is admitted to the intrinsic intellectual work of the university must be admitted by a title of intellectual legitimacy.

Likewise whatever is given an intrinsic place in the intellectual work of the scholar *as such*, must be legitimized by the same credentials, must show the stamp of knowledge, truth and intellectual discipline.

Now it seems to me that both Christian anti-intellectualism and anti-intellectual secularism deprive revelation, faith and theology of these credentials. They agree in the conclusion that revelation, faith and theology cannot find a legitimate place *intrinsic* to the intellectual work of the scholar or of the university, and consequently that the university and the intellectual can call themselves a Christian university or a Christian intellectual only extrinsically—as a man might call himself a “blond intellectual” or a “bourbon-drinking scholar.”

The case is quite different in the main Christian tradition. Herein revelation, faith and theology are found to be intrinsic to the work and life of scholarship: first of all by the same title as any other discipline, that is in virtue of being knowledge and having validated intellectual content; secondly because they make available to scholarship facts and principles which no other discipline can provide—and these about matters of the highest value for the understanding of man and the world. This tradition agrees with the secular scholar that purely extrinsic authority, emotional commitments, preferences of prejudice, have no title to intrinsic place within the intellectual work of the university. The issue does not lie here. The issue is really one of fundamental epistemology and of fact. Are the power and the resource of human reason as limited as anti-intellectual secularism believes? Are reason's ways to knowledge as narrowly confined as secularism asserts? Is revelation a pseudo-fact, as secularists assert and usually assume?

The Christian intellectual sees revelation as validated fact which must be taken into account as any other fact; he sees faith as having a valid knowledge content which must be added to man's other knowledge; he sees theology as a valid intellectual elaboration of this fact and this knowledge. But in addition he accepts the full range of disciplines which have developed in Western culture. He wants geology and physics and psychiatry and literature and history and theology and all the rest within the university; he wants to take all knowledge into account, to work out laboriously the proper limitations and bearing of each and the interrelationship of all.

On this view, to omit revelation from a university is as serious (and for the same reasons) and indeed more serious (for special reasons) as to omit history or biology. The facts of revelation and faith and the elaborated insights of theology are part of the intellectual patrimony of educated people to which we all have a right as much as we have a right to the facts of science and the insights of literature.

The transmission of the facts and principles of revelation will be, in the earliest years of training, carried on, as in other disciplines, by a sort of indoctrination. We teach young children the ordinary rules of hygiene—to brush their teeth—not by giving

them a course in scientific medicine; we give them historical fact, not by laying before them all the evidence for their critical evaluation but by simply telling them that these are the facts. So also in religion. This, though completely justified, is not liberal education. When the children come to college we wish to bring them to intellectual maturity, to a personal possession of their knowledge, at least—since this cannot be done thoroughly and in detail—in principle. However critical we may wish them to be, we do not want them to leave college confused or negative about the validated facts of any discipline. So each discipline aims to bring them to a critical grasp of its facts and validated principles, and this by the method proper to the discipline itself. Theology is here no exception, though anti-intellectual secularism would demand that criticism in theology be conducted by the same rules as in some other discipline such as the physical sciences.

The Christian scholar of the intellectual tradition is thus the integral heir of Western culture. He accepts and embraces all the disciplines whether of Christian or pagan or secular origin, takes all the facts into account and interrelates all disciplines. He evaluates method, evidence, criticism in function of the discipline in question. If he is wrong, he still has all that the secularist has; if he is right, he has all this and a great deal more, a new intellectual dimension to the whole of his knowledge.

And we need not fear that Christian scholarship will chill devotion and worship. On the contrary the Christian scholar finds, as Saint Augustine did, that his hunger for knowledge is a hunger for God, that his pursuit of truth blends into and becomes one with his love of the Truth which is God.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN AMERICAN ECONOMIC LIFE

LOUIS W. NORRIS

PRESIDENT, MACMURRAY COLLEGE

JOHN RUSKIN complained in 1874 that women should dress with greater simplicity in order to put down the curses of luxury and waste which were consuming England. The women were prone, said Ruskin, to apologize to themselves for their vanity and extravagance by saying: "It is good for trade." In our own day it is Lewis Mumford who warns that the overhead involved in maintaining economic prosperity threatens to eat up the profits which should make a civilized society possible. To eat pork for the sake of supporting the meat packers and butter to save the dairymen, makes extraneous motives into decisive motives for satisfying economic wants. We let "the preparatory acts deplete the appropriate consummations," as Mumford puts it.¹

Concern for education of women must lead us to enable women so to grasp economic forces as to be delivered from such absurdities. Whatever reason may move a woman to seek education or whatever resources may enable her to obtain it, her use of it affects the national economy. This must be so because she herself is woven so intricately into the web of the economy.

While the question of how a woman's education should affect her relation to the economy of her world has always been pertinent, it is especially engaging today. This follows, in the first place, from the fact that the economy expands more rapidly than the population increases. We are confronting a daily demonstration of the Malthusian law in reverse. With this rising tide of available economic goods their import for women can be more dramatically perceived.

Secondly, one of the major driving forces in American peacetime economy consists in the demand by business that luxuries become necessities. American life jogs along acceptably if a third or even two-thirds of the citizens do not vote. But if one-

¹ *The Conduct of Life*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1951, p. 269.

third ceased buying what were lately known as luxuries, economic catastrophe would ensue.² Do women aid and abet this trend and should their education let them?

Thirdly, a significantly increasing percentage of women want to become economic producers and an increasing percentage *seem*, at least, to need to. Does their education make rational their desire for employment and does it qualify them for it?

Further, this rapidly growing involvement of women in the economic processes of the country is attended by a parallel growth in leisure available to women as well as men. Liberal education was first designed for the leisured class, the aristocracy whose slaves cared for their routine needs of existence. In America liberal education is increasingly sought by a democracy that has won leisure for itself after meeting its own routine needs. Technology has shortened the working week and lessened its strains. With the doubling of students in college in the next dozen years, the extended application of brains to production will inevitably reduce the work load further. The anomaly cannot be avoided that while more women seem to be giving up leisure in order to work, they are in effect creating a greater sum total of leisure for their families and perhaps even for themselves. Does their education validate this increase in leisure and does it qualify them to exploit it?

This expanded role of women in economic affairs can be examined more adequately by considering developments in the last 15 years with respect to women's production, consumption and investment of wealth. The educator must be alert to the import of these developments for learning.

Perhaps the most dramatic development in American economy in the last 15 years has been the marked rise in numbers of women who work outside the home. In 1940 women were about 25% of the total labor force, while in 1955 they made up 33% of it. Of the women employed outside the home in 1940, 25% were married, whereas today about 55% are married. About 15% of all married women worked outside the home in 1940, but twice that percentage are so employed today. "Women consti-

² Joseph Wood Krutch, "Thoreau on Madison Avenue," *Saturday Review*, 38: 5, January 29, 1955, p. 31. See also, Gilbert Burck and Sanford Parker, "The Consumer Markets, 1954-59," *Fortune*, 50: 2, August, 1954, p. 180.

tute the country's greatest labor reserve," according to Mary T. Norton, former Congresswoman from New Jersey. In future, women over 30 will increasingly seek employment. The fact that opportunities are still highly restricted for women with advanced educational attainments, and the fact that about 80% of these women do work they can learn quickly on the job,³ have a large bearing on the formal education of women.

Women, like men, work because they have to, because they want to or both. Since nearly half the population, at least in America, existed in reasonable comfort without working outside the home until the 20th century, this new trend must be due chiefly to women's increased desire to be gainfully employed. Even the assertion by a woman that she works because she has to may only mean that she works because she wants to maintain a given standard of living. It is this new desire to be an economic producer which constitutes a phenomenon educators must grasp.

Several factors have contributed to this desire. First, the multiplication of gadgets has made housework shorter and industrial work easier. Second, jobs open to women are less and less different from those held by men. In 1940 only three of the 451 occupations commonly listed had not been entered by women—locomotive engineer, fireman and fire fighter. Surely these are today no longer sacred to men, if the vocation of fireman exists at all. Third, women have discovered that not all of their talents are used in the home, especially in the years of middle and later life. Women want "psychic income," to use a phrase from Kate Mueller,⁴ as well as economic income. Fourth, many women believe that not all the potentials of their home will be realized unless they supplement the family income. Lynn White holds that women are working because of marriage, not despite it.⁵ Finally, larger participation by women in political and social life must give them a desire for larger participation in the common good by joining in the enterprise of economic production.

³ Kate Hevner Mueller, *Educating Women for a Changing World*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1954, p. 75.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁵ "The Changing Context of Women's Education." *Marriage and Family Living*, November, 1955, p. 293.

Probably the goal of full employment advocated by some—that is jobs for all who want them when they want them—will never be realized by women. This must be so because, first, a husband's employment will continue to take precedence in most cases. He can never perform some of the functions of the home so well as his wife. Women can do nearly any job a man can, but in order to insist on some employment privileges they force their personalities into an artificial mold. Married and some unmarried women are thus not as mobile in seeking the labor market congenial to them as are men. Secondly, homemaking and the child-rearing period may make some of a woman's early training and experience obsolete. When she re-enters the labor market she may be further disadvantaged by deterioration in strength and personal appearance.⁶ Third, the threat of impermanence due to child-bearing or other family cares, ill health, inheritance or similar causes, prevents large investment in training programs, advancement and prestige. Fourth, professional growth which assures distinguished employment remains restricted because the professional associations of men in club and pullman, where much business is actually done, will probably never be completely open to women.

Even if the crusade for parity of employment with men could be won by women, it would undoubtedly turn out like the crusade for equality with men in education. Now that women can study anything men do, many of them have decided that their peculiar genius calls for some concentrations of their own. Parity of employment may be an abstract right attractive to some women but in many senses, excepting of course equal pay for equal work, it would be a faded laurel when won.

A large measure of choice remains with the average woman as to whether she will work, when she will work and what kind of work she will undertake. The typical woman needs to confront at least three criteria in making her decision on these questions, and her education should supply them. First, let her decide whether she surrenders to work as a means of further material advantages merely, or whether she chooses work as a means of

⁶ Babette Kass and Rose C. Feld, *The Economic Strength of Business and Professional Women*, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, New York, 1954, p. 37.

self-expression and personal enrichment for herself and her family. This option is rarely open to men. It puts in a woman's hands a leverage on the major values in life in a way many a man would envy. Second, let her choose to help so far as possible in producing what needs to be produced. If women need "psychic income" they will get little of it from the realization that the backaches of their employment have come from the useless baubles of a luxury-ridden society or the debilitating products of liquor vats. Third, let her consider what her unique contribution as a woman can be to the world of production. Esther Eberstadt Brooke, an eminent management consultant, believes there is only one thing women can contribute to business and industry and that is "... a spiritual infusion, distinctively feminine."⁷ A gentility in human relations, a sense of moral responsibility for the fabulous know-how of business and industry are badly needed. Women can contribute vastly to the know-why of economic production. Their contribution will be greater here than in the know-how of production.

Women as consumers have probably even greater influence than they have as producers of wealth. The common belief that women buy 80% of the consumer goods sold is undoubtedly exaggerated. Women serve in large part as agents for their families. In the days of "Life With Father," father gave the orders about what to buy and what brands to select. Today mother makes the ultimate decisions on groceries, her own clothes, many of the children's clothes and many household furnishings and appliances. Beyond cosmetics and her personal garments, mother is advised by the family on practically everything she buys, since consumer goods affect the whole family. It remains true however that the lady of the house figures crucially in the purchase of 60% to 70% of the consumer goods bought by the 46,800,000 household units in the United States. Add to this the purchases of single women and the significance of women in the consumer's market becomes overwhelming.

Further, marketers are seeking to influence women in broader and broader areas.⁸ Even now there is scarcely a single man-

⁷ "Women in Business and Management," in Marion Turner Sheehan (Ed.), *The Spiritual Woman*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955, p. 22.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 270.

only market. Power-steering and power-brakes, together with Easter egg colors, have about taken the choice of the family car over into the women's department. The role of women as consumers is apparently increasing from an already predominant place.

All this means that more responsibility for molding the American standard of living rests with women than men, even though men produce the major share of the national income. Women are not cats-paws for a family standard of living which they cannot influence or control. For a woman to buy what she knows her family does not need or what is of inferior quality is intolerable. Yet Dorothy Canfield Fisher believes that many, if not most, American women do just these things. The American family is twice as well dressed, ten times as well shod and 40 times as well provided with plumbing as European families. Yet they have nowhere near the provision in family life for Beethoven, Plato, Edward R. Murrow, or for reading to the children. Women apparently are assisting their families to become "efficient consumers" but this does not mean that they are intelligent, cultured or moral consumers.

Defensible criteria of consumption need to be found by women and their education should help them in this search.

First, let women as the chief influence in consumption consider whether their purchases reach beyond basic animal desires to genuinely human satisfactions. The cultural, artistic, moral and religious needs of personality are what lead man to become a human rather than a merely sentient being. To grow up in the American economy is to be in a sense "a rich man's child," to quote Fred T. Wilhelms. Life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which a man possesseth, but perhaps more truly, as Thoreau would say, in the knowledge of how to live well in poverty!

Secondly, as a responsible consumer every woman may well consider whether her purchase derives more from fashion or function. Conformity to fashion is a deadly weapon of every advertiser and it preys on even the most daring originator. Some advertising firms take as their avowed purpose the promotion of "psychological obsolescence." Used-car lots are full of cars without wrap-around windshields, though they are still good for another 75,000 miles.

Third, let women consider whether their program of consumption contributes to human originality or to mechanization. Mumford urges that we "effect a benign simplification" which will "restore the initiative to life." We must "counterbalance every mechanical refinement. . . ." Mechanical gadgets which remove the reasons or occasions for exercise of imagination are suspect unless some compensating occasion be won. Money spent for books or a trip to Europe may make a far richer human being than a better grade of car or a larger deep freeze.

Women are unquestionably the dominating influence in the consumers' market. They are therefore powerful influences in setting the pattern of civilization. Education of women must then look well to the criteria of consumption.

Women's role as investors of wealth makes even more plain the attention that education must give to women's economics. It is common knowledge that women own 75% to 80% of the wealth of the country. This is so for the tax protection it gives their husbands and because they outlive their husbands by five to seven years. Wealth accumulates in the hands of women toward their later years in particular. The fact that women receive 70% of the death benefits paid by life insurance companies provides a commentary on this situation. About 20% of all insurance outstanding is written on the lives of women, an increase of two-thirds since 1945.¹⁰ Evidently women are increasingly choosing insurance as a means of investment. Another avenue of investment more frequently chosen is home ownership. In 1940 about 44% of American families owned their own homes, whereas 55% do now. Women's increased earnings have undoubtedly helped to raise this percentage.¹¹

Though evidence appears that more women are investing their own earnings and those of their family in insurance and home ownership, the fact remains that most of the investment of their funds is made for them by men. Of the 160,000 members in the Association of Business and Professional Women but 18% are owners of business and professional establishments.¹² A con-

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 270.

¹⁰ *Life Insurance Fact Book*, Institute of Life Insurance, New York, 1953, p. 17.

¹¹ "The Status of Women in the United States, 1953." Bulletin 249, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, p. 13.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

siderable number of these have undoubtedly been left to them by their husbands. Where would the trust departments of most banks be if they had no women to advise?

Happily some women are beginning to find their way into investment careers. Few statistics are available concerning women who hold positions of responsibility in financial firms except in banking. Of all bank employees 66% are women though but 9% are officers. The latter range from chairmen of the board (there were 27 of such in 1951) on down, the title of assistant cashier being the most common. Women are beginning to make their way as life insurance agents and executives also. In 1951 in 607 insurance companies there were 98 women directors and another 100 women who were junior or apprentice officers.¹³

Women can understand and manage investments fully as well as men. The fact that they rarely do manage their investments marks a carry-over from the Victorian protective society when business was thought too vulgar and complex for dainty women. In this age of insecurity it is often said that women are especially tense and anxious over their future. But much worry stems from the unknown. If women knew what their financial future would be in the event of their husband's demise or incapacitation, and what the lot of their children would be if both parents were to be lost, they would be freed from much anxiety and insecurity.

Here again a woman has a chance to decide in important ways the business operations she wishes to foster and those from which she wishes to draw her living. A woman may learn how to invest in those forms of business which deserve to prosper. Granting that some investments cannot easily be liquidated, women can in the main choose to forward one business and restrain another. Herein lies enormous power to influence the course of American business, which few women realize they possess.

A woman's education should help her decide what business to sponsor with her investment. First, she needs to look to the quality and necessity of the product prepared by the company. Second, the relation of the company to its employees and their

¹³ Catherine B. Cleary, "Women in the World of Finance," *Bulletin: American Association of University Women*, Vol. 48, No. 2, January, 1955, pp. 71-72.

families must count. Third, the place the business takes in the welfare of its community deserves scrutiny. To live on income derived in part or whole from substandard or tenement housing, or from a business that mistreats minority labor groups, or saps the welfare of its neighborhood, should harrow the conscience of every intelligent woman.

Plainly education for women must among other things orientate them to the world of economic fact. Every woman must know her economic powers, not so much as a mere "cultural subject" like literature and history, but as a means of effectuating her rapport with nature and human society. This conclusion can be reached before deciding whether education should be vocational or purely liberal or both. Women possess enormous power to affect the economic life of the country. Even if a woman spends her life as merely a consumer and investor but not as a producer, this influence must not go unrealized, or unwisely guided when realized. If she becomes a producer as well as a consumer and investor, the educational equipment of a woman in economics is of the utmost importance.

This conclusion does not lead to the requirement of any given course. The qualifications called for are much broader than that. It summons women rather to a new recognition that they have become custodians of wealth in the last 25 years, which puts new obligations upon them. Aristotle put acquisition of wealth high on his list of virtues because it serves as the means for expressing personality. In effect women have acquired a means of expressing their own personalities and those of their families in ways never before dreamed of. Education must waken them to this fact and supply them with criteria for such self-expression as well as criteria for setting the direction of influence in business which they wish to take.

Women should prepare in college to do what their generation needs most. This does not mean that every woman should expect to become a producer of wealth, for America has already produced vases surpluses that threaten unemployment and depression. The feeling on the part of many women that they are "parasitic" if they do not work¹⁴ merely reflects a slavish willingness to conform to economic fashion. An intelligent grasp by

¹⁴ Lynn White, *op. cit.*, p. 293.

each woman of her own economic role may or may not stipulate that she work. Bancroft Beatley's criticism of the typical college for women, that it offers a mere "luxury" program calling for graduate professional training on the part of those who expect to earn a living, misses this point. To enable a woman to understand her economic role in life is to offer her no luxury but a necessity.

In the last analysis, every woman should be equipped while in college with at least one technique or method of earning a living. Even if her analysis of her economic role specifies that she need not or should not work, this role can change. Death, depression, war, divorce, illness can shift without notice the economic role of a woman. If a college has equipped a woman to judge adequately when this has happened, and enabled her to make a three-point landing in the productive world when it does happen, the college has done its stint.

INDUSTRIAL SUPPORT FOR THE WOMEN'S COLLEGES

OTTO F. KRAUSHAAR
PRESIDENT, GOUCHER COLLEGE

THE growing interest of the American business community in the welfare and advancement of the independent colleges and universities of the land is one of the striking developments in higher education today. Large-scale corporate aid to education is an integral part of the expanding concept of corporate citizenship which is a distinctive feature of American business enterprise. There is nothing like it in the other capitalist countries of the West. As Dwight McDonald noted in his recent articles on the Ford Foundation in *The New Yorker*, French businessmen, for example, find the purpose and philosophy of our philanthropic foundations utterly incomprehensible. Why should one work and compete for profits only to give them away?

But to us this is nothing new. It goes back historically to the time when the Carnegies, the Rockefellers, the Guggenheims and others who built vast fortunes out of mining, railroading, banking or manufacturing began to cast about for ways of making their great accumulation of profits serve socially useful ends. But what is comparatively new is that corporations as well as individuals have come to feel a sense of social responsibility and stewardship in the distribution of profits, and that this is now coming to be regarded as normal and commonplace. Of course there are still many directors and stockholders who take a dim view of "giving away the stockholder's money." But they have been crowded into a defensive position and their arguments are drowned by the chorus of outspoken business leaders who are undeterred by legal niceties when a good and necessary cause is at stake. Moreover recent legal clarifications are hastening the removal of the disputed barriers which have in the past cast doubt on the legality of making contributions to education which could be of only indirect benefit to the corporation donor.

The results of this trend are compiled for us in the literature prepared by the Council for Financial Aid to Education. The figures show a cautious growth beginning with specific grants

more or less directly related to the corporate donor's interest to more unrestricted grants in the general interest. Although the grants of the big corporations now catch the headlines, it was the smaller firms with strong interests in local institutions that pioneered financial aid without strings. Corporation contributions to all causes grew from \$30,000,000 in 1936 to \$399,000,000 in 1953, while the percentage of taxable income contributed advanced from 0.39% to 1.03%. The Council's analysis of the giving of 367 corporations reveals that those with assets of less than \$50,000,000 have in the past contributed a far larger percentage of their taxable income than the big companies, although the giants are beginning to contribute more in relation to their net earnings. In 1953 approximately 25¢ of the corporations' gift dollar was allocated to education. In 1954-55 the total financial support for higher education from business—not counting contract research grants—was \$39,000,000 or approximately 12% of gifts and grants to colleges and universities from all sources.

What do these statistics tell us? They tell a story of a source of support which started from small beginnings in many scattered localities, of accelerated growth during the immediate past and of immense potential for the future. It is evident from the relatively small number of firms that are giving and the relatively small fraction of net taxable income that is devoted to philanthropy that corporation giving is still in its infancy. And as we have all learned from our correspondence and interviews with the heads of business firms, many that have not yet made grants are in the throes of establishing a policy, while others are examining their philanthropic experience with a view to extending or changing their practices.

Concern is expressed now and then in academic circles lest the continued and growing support of higher education by business may lead to undue influence of business on the colleges. Memories go back to the 1920's when certain organizations undertook to criticize and revise textbooks in social science with a view to creating in the minds of students a climate favorable to business enterprise. Today there is a remarkable dearth of evidence, amidst all the plans for corporation aid to education, of any designs to gain a special influence over college teaching or ad-

ministration, the contents of textbooks, appointments to the faculty and so on. From the experience of recent years it seems plain that there is much more to fear from the elected representatives of the people turned investigators, from alumni with special axes to grind (such as Mr. Buckley at Yale) or from fanatical groups organized to save the commonwealth, than from businessmen. There may perhaps be a danger of another sort, namely that college administrators may be tempted to load the curriculum with specialized vocational courses requested by local business and industrial firms and bring about an unwitting but fundamental change in the philosophy and aims of a liberal college. The best assurance of a wholesome relationship between corporate donors and the colleges lies in the multiplicity of grants made by various donors to different types of institutions. Much will depend too on the skill and integrity with which college administrators interpret the philosophy and aims and needs of their institutions to businessmen. Not the least of the benefits of corporation support of the colleges is the better understanding and mutual respect which businessmen and college heads are gaining as they face each other in offices and over the lunch table.

The questions which concern us most at this meeting are not these general aspects of corporation support of the colleges but the special situation of the colleges for women. How have they fared nationally? First it would be appropriate to say, bless the Ford Foundation! Here for once we were all treated as full-fledged members of the collegiate world without equivocation or need for special pleading. But in most other distributions we have shared poorly in comparison with other types of institution. As is shown by the recent survey findings relating to women's colleges compiled by the CFAE, while contributions from corporations and business firms accounted for 12 per cent of the total financial support received by all private colleges in 1954-55 from all sources, the 29 independent women's colleges received only 6 per cent of their support from this source, and of this just over half was for buildings, grounds and facilities. Moreover the women's colleges received a larger percentage of their total support by way of state or regional fund-raising associations than any other type of college—further evidence that the appeal of the women's colleges is relatively weaker than other types. To set these

rather gloomy statistics in the proper perspective we may be reminded that the strong women's colleges have done very well indeed in fund raising from all sources since the war, especially in the effectiveness of alumni solicitation where the women's colleges stand in second place, just a shade behind the private institutions for men.

There is no secret about the reasons why financial aid to the women's colleges from business and industry has been slow in developing. It was only natural that support of higher education by national corporations should begin at the point where corporation heads and directors could most readily justify it before skeptical stockholders. And this meant that in the initial stages the stress was on giving to the sources of trained personnel, in order to increase educated manpower, and on giving with reference to the principal location of employments and markets. Since women constitute a minority of the labor force in business and industry they were by-passed at first except by grants of the type given to women's colleges by Procter and Gamble in recognition of the corporation's primary market. But important second thoughts are beginning to take root and businessmen are asking themselves whether in a time of high profits the corporation has discharged its responsibility to the community when it has underwritten a steady flow of educated manpower plus educational opportunities for the children of their employees. What of the teachers, the social workers, the nurses, the army of volunteers working for civic betterment and, above all, the education of wives and mothers? The mammoth distribution of grants by the Ford Foundation bespeaks a new concept, a new philosophy of corporation giving which is bound to have a profound influence in setting others to thinking of how they can make their grants serve broader human ends and the future.

In other words time is in our favor. But it will take more than time to bring this growing potential for the women's colleges to realization. We have not been forehanded enough in stating our case, especially in view of the lingering doubts that exist in the minds of some men and women as to whether the education of young women is really worth-while. There are masculine enclaves still where with reference to women not a little but much education is a dangerous thing, where a woman's

prime function is thought to be to provide suitably flattering companionship for the male of the species. As long as the contribution of colleges for women is not well understood or appreciated, we can expect a lukewarm response especially from hard-headed businessmen who are besieged by appeals of every kind. We cannot expect them to pay heed to our problems if they are skeptical of the merits of the enterprise we represent.

We will do well therefore to take to heart the conclusions of the Advisory Committee on the Women's Colleges appointed by the CFAE with President McBride as Chairman. At the cost of repeating what you have already read, let me emphasize the following points. The Committee recommended that the women's colleges in stating their case should stress the contributions which college women make to community services and to the intellectual and business life of the country. The emphasis should be on the college-educated woman, not on the special problems of the women's colleges. The committee recommended moreover that the women's colleges present their cases individually or through their state or regional associations, rather than undertake a joint effort to that end, and that they carry their request to all types of corporations, not just those having a special interest in women.

In this connection I believe it is pertinent to report to you on the outcome of a project which we at Goucher undertook last winter. Our original aim was to prepare a letter setting forth the case for corporation aid to the women's colleges and to send this to a selected list of national corporations over the signatures of the heads of 29 colleges. It soon became evident that this approach might conflict with plans which the CFAE had under way so we dropped our plan. But we eventually sent the letter out on our own late last spring to 530 corporations. It was not intended as a letter of solicitation, but in the offices of wary corporation executives it was taken as such. Of the approximately 150 replies received thus far (they are still coming in) 72 represent the following classifiable ways of saying no:

- 37 give only in their own area, state or plant cities;
- 16 confine their giving largely to fields of direct interest;
- 4 confine their giving to community chest, Red Cross, etc.;
- 3 felt there were legal barriers to giving to higher education;

- 12 implied that any broad distribution would be made only through state associations.

Among the hopeful replies,

- 13 pleaded a budget already allocated but held out hope for the future;
12 are reexamining or expanding their programs and *may* include women's colleges;
9 are still studying a plan for aid to education.

While the letters brought no immediate results whatever, they are useful as a screening device. Our tentative conclusions thus far would be that many so-called national corporations are not really national in their outlook but think of their major operating areas or home-office locality when selecting recipients for aid. Utilities, drug companies and railroads appear to be among our poorest prospects, while among the best are oil, tobacco and soap companies—most of them in the top 100 corporations in sales, with widely sold products in highly competitive fields. A definite pattern among the more hopeful replies is hard to establish on such limited evidence. Finally, our experience confirmed again what we all know, namely that the letter as a method of solicitation is a very weak reed to lean upon unless it is a follow-up on a personal conference.

In contrast to the above experience, our relations with industry in our own locality and state and with a limited list of national corporations with offices or plants in our locality has been a very fruitful one.

In closing permit me to venture a few general opinions.

There may be a real danger in shifting the income pattern of the college by relying too heavily on annual giving by business and industry to college operating funds. In the first place, we are living in a time of unprecedented earnings but a business recession would dry up a substantial segment of income from this source. Of course it may be argued that other sources of income would decline also, but it seems doubtful that they would be affected so rapidly or severely. In the second place, some are beginning to suspect that vigorously prosecuted annual campaigns, especially those conducted by fund-raising federations, may hurt the prospects of individual colleges in periodic capital-raising efforts. I am still old-fashioned enough to believe that

the best assurance of financial stability lies in an ample endowment fund. It seems the part of doubtful wisdom to press hard for annual funds if this is done at the expense of greatly restricting the sources of capital gifts.

Next, before we begin to operate far from home base it is well to cultivate our own garden in the locality and state where we are well known. It is there that we can state our case most fully and effectively and in so doing enter into pleasant personal relationships with business executives. One of the problems that have arisen in connection with the rise of the American College Fund and numerous state fund-raising federations is that these devices, helpful and necessary as they undoubtedly are, inevitably tend to depersonalize the relationship between the individual college and the corporation donor. The colleges may not be well served in the long run by anything that smacks of a national dole parceled out on the basis of a general formula.

Another point, those of us who are truly independent by virtue of receiving no state or federal tax funds have an especially strong case to present. We represent free enterprise in education and there is no reason why we should not say so when we talk to business men. Doubtless we do not understand quite the same thing by free enterprise as the corporation heads with whom we confer across the polished mahogany table. But this too can be an interesting topic for discussion and an opportunity to interpret what our colleges stand for and what is requisite for the life of learning and teaching.

And finally there is the problem of time. We cannot be everywhere at the same time. We cannot patrol the whole national and local philanthropic waterfront and also continue to be of much use to our faculties, our staffs and our students. This appears to be the permanent dilemma of our profession and one of the chief reasons why our average tenure of office is so brief. I believe we should give more thought to the thing that we call euphemistically "the development office," to the selection of the proper staff, to the laying down of a program that can gradually develop its own momentum so that we can become once again presidents of our colleges, at least on a part-time basis.

THE WORK AND POLICIES OF THE KRESGE FOUNDATION

HOWARD C. BALDWIN
VICE PRESIDENT, THE KRESGE FOUNDATION

SEBASTIAN S. KRESGE, now 88 years of age, physically active and mentally alert, founded The Kresge Foundation in the year 1924. His organization of a 5-and-10-cent variety store chain had resulted in a fortune beyond his needs and desires. His early training had equipped him with a well defined sense of stewardship to which maturity brought a real gratitude for abundant and unexpected blessings. It is unnecessary perhaps to remark that 31 years ago proper tax avoidance alone was not a compelling motive for large scale philanthropy, and in this instance it neither suggested nor inspired the creation of the foundation.

The purposes of the foundation as set forth in the charter of the corporation organized under the laws of Michigan are broad. Briefly expressed, the benefits available by the expenditure of annual income are to be used "to benefit humanity."

With a measure of experience, we have found that there is no easy way to raise the level of humanity. It is a long and difficult job.

Our policies may be poor things but they are our own. They are the product of experience extending over nearly a third of a century. A statement of them contains no inference that they are better or worse than others. We know only too well that different methods must be employed in different situations. We have made no attempt to follow the pattern of similar institutions. Uniformity in foundation operation is not in our judgment a desirable result. The goals may differ and may be reached by different avenues. One of the virtues inherent in a large foundation is a capacity to experiment and thus by trial and error to find a formula that will demonstrate its value.

The Kresge Foundation is bigger than most and smaller than some. The gifts made by Mr. Kresge started in a small way and were increased over a period of years so that a yearly average of our giving does not give the entire picture. As of 1 January 1955 we had made grants totaling \$33,565,010. During the

year 1955 our grants totalled \$4,252,435—for a grand total of \$37,817,445.

Our work must speak for itself. We have made wide distribution of a detailed report of 30 years of administration.

We have not specialized in any one field of activity or research. It is perhaps fair to say that we are somewhat like the general family doctor as compared to the medical specialist. We do not claim that this is the best procedure, but we have found through experience that there is need for this sort of service in the present expanding state of our national life.

We act upon applications in writing only and do not use prepared blank forms. The applicant should give us the relevant facts and make a definite request. We have found this procedure to be simple and effective. It often reveals unintentionally some things we should like to know which are not otherwise obtainable.

Our Board of Trustees is relatively small and we do not have many investigators or a large clerical personnel. We may in the future of necessity adopt the professional approach. Thus far every trustee, from the founder down, is in a real sense a fulltime trustee, familiar with many phases of the applications submitted, granted and denied.

As I have indicated, we may give away income only. This may be debatable as a matter of policy but it defines our limits. Sometime during each year the process of decision is interrupted until another year's income is available. For instance, in the year 1955 the volume of applications was so great that we had committed most of the year's income by midsummer.

Even within a broad charter we must have some limitations in our policy. There are certain areas wherein we do not operate. We do not make grants to individuals. We make no grants in the field of propaganda.

We have made few if any grants to provide educational scholarships. This indicates of course no lack of interest in this commendable branch of benevolence, but government and many private institutions have entered this field and we have not yet determined as a matter of policy when or how we should undertake it. Large sums are presently available from other sources and for the present we are following a policy of postponement, since there are certain intangibles in the matter of earning and securing an education not easily defined.

Generally we make no grants to tax-supported institutions. We have made exceptions, however, and have provided necessary facilities of a special character performing service unlikely to attract the legislative dollar.

We believe in churches and the advancement of religion. The end of World War II found expanded population and the restrictions of the war period had stopped new construction. Many large communities were without places of worship and the trustees allotted several hundred thousand dollars to ease this situation. We make no apology for it. For practical reasons we were compelled to stop this type of grant. The applications snowballed to a volume where our income and our wisdom became alike inadequate. While we desire to advance religion, we feel that is no part of foundation policy to foster sectarian interests.

We do not knowingly contribute to overhead and administration expenses. Such appeals are often labeled as special projects and sometimes properly so. But to become committed to a program of annual maintenance is bad from both standpoints—of the donor and of the donee. Once started, when the grant is suspended the institution is really worse off than it was before. The establishment of a broad annual base of small gifts for annual maintenance is better than non-recurring substantial grants from foundations for this purpose.

We do not establish new institutions, preferring to rely on the proven abilities of management in existing instrumentalities. Notwithstanding the possible penalties of this policy, we feel there is justification for it. An exception has been the creation of the Kresge Eye Institute in Detroit. The trustees felt that a large industrial center furnished an excellent clinical opportunity to provide a needed and unduplicated service. Under the leadership of Dr. A. D. Ruedemann, impressive work has been done in both eye research and community service. We are happy with the results and are presently committed to full support for an additional five-year period.

We do not contribute to preparatory schools or junior colleges. This of course does not imply any judgment on the scope and vitality of these institutions. It is indicative of the simple fact that in our operation we must have limits somewhere in the field

of educational grants because of income limitation. We are convinced we have responsibilities in areas other than education.

Our policies of course are not all negative. We operate under a broad charter with wide aims and purposes. Our annual program continues to be elastic. We have no desire to close any avenue that in the judgment of the trustees may lead to a better job of distribution.

We have made large grants, considering our size, and we have made small grants. To be specific, a small grant may be \$25,000 and upwards. The smaller ones are generally "seed" grants, made under conditions wherein our participation is expected to encourage the participation of others and thus broaden the base of support. In our experience, conditional grants have been very successful as incentives in the raising of large campaign funds. After all, individual giving is still the great benevolent asset and is relatively undeveloped. Percentagewise, few individuals are educated to the extent of their own responsibility in this area.

The question of "brick and mortar" expenditures is, and will be, a debatable item. We would prefer to make progress in the field of intangibles, realizing that man's only real hope for the long future is progress in realms that are spiritual.

We have been informed by responsible institutional administrators that it will take many million dollars to bring college and hospital buildings and equipment up to date. In some instances colleges with prewar enrolments of 500 are caring for a present registration of 1000, and the end is not in sight. Expanded population is straining present facilities and wear, tear and obsolescence cannot be overlooked.

Giving away money is not an easy job. The difficult problem for trustees is the matter of making decisions. It is like running a hotel. Everyone else can do it better.

We are under no illusions about the power of money. But it is silly to dismiss it as worthless. It means many good things. It represents dormitories, classrooms, hospitals. It represents research facilities and the priceless efforts of men of creative skill and genius. Probably of equal importance for people, it means education, travel, television, trips to the country and, here and there, a vase of flowers. Neither are we under any illusions as to

the limitations of the power of money. Money alone cannot build character or transform evil unto good; it cannot restore the influence and vitality of the home; neither can it maintain the valleys and plains of peace. Spent alone, it might as well stay in the vaults. It becomes palsied and impotent. It cries for partnership with leaders of character and good will who value good tools in the creation and enlargement of life for man, who is created in the image of God.

But it is nowhere written that man should not help himself. He has made great progress on his own, particularly in the arts and sciences. In the area of human relations his record is not so good. The least that can be expected from foundations is that they shall not stand in his way. The best that can be hoped for is to help remove the disabilities and impediments that keep him from a full realization of his potentialities.

If our foundation can in a small way do its share toward the attainment of man's best aspirations, we shall have executed the aims of a generous donor and shall feel that our own task has been well done.

GIVING AWAY MONEY IS A DIFFICULT JOB

G. HAROLD DULING
SECRETARY, LILLY ENDOWMENT, INC.

A WRITER in a recent issue of *The New Yorker* has given a convincing definition of a foundation, namely that "it is a large pool of money around which many people are standing, all of whom want some of it." But certainly one does not need to explain what a foundation is to a group of college presidents. If you do not know what a foundation grant is, your professional status is in jeopardy. However it is appropriate that this panel should be asked to explain the work of foundations. This is in keeping with the urgency of our time, that the general public has a right to such knowledge.

Lilly Endowment was established 25 June 1937. The book value of its present assets, as of 31 December 1954, was approximately \$27,300,000. The aggregate market value of its holdings, which are non-diversified—as of the same date—was \$51,700,000. During the past few years, the average income and expenditures has been approximately \$2,000,000, and in the 18 years of its history, the Endowment has granted an aggregate sum of \$16,300,000. Of this total amount, approximately two thirds have been granted to organizations, institutions, and agencies in the state of Indiana, and of this sum approximately one third has gone to a selected group of independent and church-related colleges in Indiana.

Representatives of many organizations direct letters of inquiry to us which ask, in essence: "Will you please tell me what you give money for so that I can write and ask for some?"

According to the purposes of its charter, the Endowment's objectives are "The promotion and support of religious, educational or charitable purposes." During the period 1945 to 1947, the officers of the foundation developed policies which provided that funds may be spent for projects in the following classifications, and in the following amounts, percentage-wise:

	<i>Proposed per cent</i>	<i>Actual 1954 per cent</i>
Social Science and Humanities, Including Religion	25	20.7
Education	35	46.0
Cultural Projects, Including Art and Music	10	5.8
Community Services	15	11.3
Public Health	7.5	11.7
Natural Science	7.5	4.5

Within these six fields, the directors are currently placing major emphasis on education, religion and community services. The other three fields receive minor attention so far as the distribution of funds is concerned.

The geographical distributions are made in the following manner:

	<i>Proposed per cent</i>	<i>Actual 1954 per cent</i>
Indianapolis	30	40.7
Indiana, outside Indianapolis	30	36.2
United States, outside Indiana	35	22.5
Outside United States of America	5	.6

Because of the flexibility and broad scope of the Endowment's charter, the interests of its board of directors are allowed to change with the times as social conditions change. The directors of a foundation are the foundation legally; the whole power of the foundation resides in their hands. As their interests shift, so the budgetary and geographical percentages of giving may shift as long as they adhere to the purposes of the original charter.

How does a foundation secretary perform his job within the scope of this setting? Because 90% of all requests for funds are turned down for one reason or another, the secretary, on behalf of the directors, must say no nine times out of ten—firmly, tactfully and politely.

A foundation's giving is controlled by the provisions of its charter. If a request does not come within the fields of chartered interest, it is disqualified automatically. If it fits the chartered

interests of the foundation, it must also pass the test of the scope of interest of the foundation's directors as determined by policy.

Some examples can be cited.

1. One of Lilly Endowment's fields of chartered interest is that of Community Services. As a course of policy, allocations in this field are confined almost exclusively to Red Feather and private community agencies in Indianapolis and Marion County. Our work in this field has resulted in the creation of an independent research organization, Community Surveys, Inc. Its first major research project, a Study of Philanthropy in Indianapolis, will have broad implications for every major industrial city in the United States.

2. For ethical reasons we do not support projects related to the medical field, believing that such enterprises are too close to the commercial interests of Eli Lilly and Company. Nor do we wish to jeopardize our tax exempt status with the Internal Revenue Department by so doing.

The Endowment's assets are not diversified; even so, it should be emphasized that it has no legal or financial connection with Eli Lilly and Company. The Endowment's assets were created out of the estate of its founder, the late Mr. J. K. Lilly, Sr., and the supplementary gifts of the members of his family.

3. Greatest emphasis in the foundation's giving is in the field of higher education. Uppermost is its assistance to a selected list of ten independent and church-related colleges in Indiana. For the most part the funds are applied to the upgrading of faculty salaries. Other unrestricted grants go to two selected colleges outside the state of Indiana and to the United Negro College Fund. Research grants are limited to the larger colleges and universities of the country. Our most significant research grant (toward which Lilly Endowment will have allocated \$1,000,000 by the end of 1958) is the Character Research Project under the direction of Dr. Ernest Ligon at Union College, Schenectady, New York. Dr. Ligon's work will be fully reported in his forthcoming book, "Dimensions of Character," scheduled for publication in 1956.

4. We receive many requests from organizations representing either extreme left-wing or right-wing points of view. We are not interested in supporting either the purely negative features

of traditional conservatism or the demoniac collectivist political movements of the 20th century. Rather we are looking for projects which establish a spirit of inquiry and reconciliation among people. Of recent years the Endowment has regularly received a request from a man listed by the Attorney General as belonging to forty-odd communist-front organizations. Obviously his requests have not been granted.

5. With the exception of the Community Chest and the Red Cross, as a general policy Lilly Endowment does not give to the constituted agencies which have mass public appeal.

How then does a foundation decide where and how to give its money? Abraham Flexner, adviser to the Rockefellers, said: "A foundation must bunch its hits and not scatter its fire like buckshot." It must avoid "scatteration" of effort. Its money is often referred to as risk or venture capital which should serve as a pump primer and not as a permanent reservoir. Foundations are project-minded. Of primary interest are projects which Mr. Eli Lilly classifies as being at the "cutting edge of inquiry" or the perimeter of knowledge. Such projects are exploratory and demonstrative in nature and funds for their support are not usually available from any other source. Andrew Carnegie called such grants "ladders upon which the aspiring may rise." Many of them are in areas of the imponderable and the intangible, and satisfying results cannot easily be established.

If a request receives favorable consideration, then the directors must decide how much should be given, under what conditions, and how long the grants should continue. What system of progress reports should be called for? How much follow-up should the secretary make by actual visitation on the scene? This is necessary in order to determine whether the funds are being used for the purpose for which they were given. As you can see from the Endowment's annual report, it is the secretary's responsibility to listen with at least a feigned expression of intelligence while the grantees explain their activities, which in our case run the gamut from Dr. Ligon's theological "infinity principle" to Purdue's "low-manganese hog"!

Conditional grants, whereby the recipient organization is asked to secure matching funds, usually dollar for dollar, have turned out to be some of our most satisfying arrangements. For the

most part, commitments should not extend beyond three to five years.

We have learned by experience that we do not necessarily solve all of the problems an organization faces by giving it all the money it asks for. In its long experience the Rockefeller Foundation has concluded:

There is a common fallacy that money can create ideas and that a great deal of money can create better ideas. Nothing could be wider from the mark. The bottleneck is always men—imaginative men with fertile ideas related to the future. For them, there is no substitute. Without them, the money of a foundation will purchase nothing but motion and futility.

Do some grants “go sour” or turn out to be what one of our directors calls “duds”? Yes, unfortunately they do. As mentioned previously, foundation money is often referred to as risk capital. Private philanthropy, because of its non-suspect character and wide latitude of choice, almost has a mandate to go into highly controversial fields. The social sciences for instance deal with explosive issues. Some blow-ups are inevitable. One thing is certain: compared to governmental outlays, foundations cannot be accused of wasting large amounts of money.

It is a privilege of each foundation to give generously. It is its duty to give wisely.

On the front of the Endowment's annual report, the story of this foundation's work is told symbolically in an expression of a trio of human hands. Remembering the life of its founder, the late Mr. J. K. Lilly, Sr., it is appropriate that these should be uplifting hands, praying hands, helping hands.

FOUNDATION OPERATING POLICIES

JOHN W. GARDNER

PRESIDENT, CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

ONE of the most important trends in the work of the major foundations over the past 40 years has been their increasing commitment to education and particularly higher education. The keen interest which the major foundations now have in education is such a familiar fact that colleges and universities take it for granted. But this interest did not always occupy the prominent place that it does today. Forty years ago a far greater proportion of the funds of the major foundations went to the other two great philanthropic areas—health and social welfare. These other fields still have virtually limitless needs for funds, and the fact that the major foundations devote themselves so heavily to education is an interesting and impressive fact.

For my part I regard it as an extremely heartening fact. Indeed I should like to regard Carnegie Corporation and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as part of the academic world, as part of our educational system. I believe that our alliance with the educators of America is deep-rooted and vital and that we can serve them in useful and constructive ways.

The officer of a foundation which concerns itself with higher education comes to know almost every facet of our colleges and universities. He comes to know the problems which beset these institutions and he gains a familiarity with all of the varied personnel involved—professors, trustees, college presidents, deans and other administrative officers. Of all of these, the ones he comes to know best are the presidents and deans. He sees them in his own offices and on their home grounds, he negotiates with them, he comes to understand their problems, and almost invariably he ends up with a good deal of admiration for them as a class. He is constrained of course to conceal this admiration, because college presidents and deans live in an atmosphere of more or less continuous heckling, and unexpected praise might seriously disconcert them.

I have come to believe that one of the reasons why foundation officers are quick to understand and sympathize with the educational administrator is that their jobs are after all very similar. It is true that the similarity breaks down on matters involving money! But in all other respects, foundation administration, far from involving any intricate inner mysteries, is characterized by the same complexities and frustrations and hazards as all educational administration. This means that not only can foundation officers understand the vicissitudes of college administration but that deans and presidents are in a better position to understand the problems and perils of foundation administration than any other group of people.

The college president or dean recognizes, for example, that there will never, never be any peace between those who wish him to be bold, brave and venturesome and those who wish him to be safe, sound and solid. The president or dean recognizes too the extraordinary hazards involved in a job which requires a great deal of "nay saying." One very distinguished foundation officer of my acquaintance always insisted that in the quiet of his old age he would write his memoirs under the title "My Declining Years." The foundation officer is not likely to be able to say yes to more than one in ten proposals and sometimes not to more than one in a hundred proposals. Every experienced administrator knows what this means in terms of human relations. Every president and dean has in his own way experienced precisely the same problem, though perhaps on a lesser scale.

It is in this matter of acceptance and rejection that the general run of foundation applicants have the least comprehension of foundation operations. I suspect that the popular notion of foundation operating policy might very well be summed up in the advice which William James, speaking of his youngest son, put in a letter to his wife. He said: "Tell him to live by *yes* and *no*— yes to everything good, and no to everything bad." If it were as simple as that sounds, the foundation business would be delightful indeed. Unfortunately, the foundation officer cannot say yes to everything good: the sum total of good and interesting and constructive ideas in American life is infinitely beyond the reach of even the largest foundation. There is a story of a foundation officer who replied to an applicant:

"I have nothing but praise for your project." That is an entertaining quip, but it is not just a joke. There isn't enough money to go around, and every foundation officer is familiar with the necessity of rejecting truly excellent proposals.

Another aspect of foundation operations which is readily comprehended by deans and college presidents is the problem of relationships with the recipients of foundation grants. Foundations lean over backward to avoid the slightest possibility of misunderstanding with the men and women who apply for their money, and having made a grant the foundations scrupulously avoid any attempt to control the intellectual life of the recipients. The foundation takes exceptional care not to give advice along with its dollars, not to engage in propagandist activities and not to influence or dominate the recipients of its money. All of this elaborate self-discipline is something with which every dean and president is thoroughly familiar in his day-to-day work. He has long since learned the elaborate rituals involved in dealing with faculty people. He does not have to be told why the foundations are so meticulous in their dealings with recipients.

Again, it is easy for the dean or president to gain a clear and realistic notion of what is meant by "risk taking" in foundation operations. It has often been said that it is the job of foundations to supply "risk capital," to take chances, to be adventurous. I firmly believe that this is true. But I believe too, that this "risk taking" can be viewed in an excessively romantic light. Not long ago a social scientist urged that the major foundations establish a "crackpot fund" to be devoted to the support of "crackpot ideas." He charged that the major foundations were being altogether too routine, conventional and unimaginative. He insisted that the only way to give rein to imagination and creativity was to support crackpots.

This is not an unfamiliar suggestion. The pressures toward conformity in America today have gotten some people so worried that they speak almost nostalgically of crackpots. I must say that I share a distaste for the pressures toward conformity but I cannot share the sentimental endorsement of crackpots. I have been looking into the matter for some time, and I must ask you to take my word for it that no one is really enthusiastic about crackpots generally. He is only enthusiastic about *his*

kind of crackpot. The fact that a man is operating well outside the normal bounds of conformity does not *automatically* make him an interesting bet for a foundation, or for a college faculty.

College presidents and deans are not likely to be confused on this point. Although I am sure that most of them approve the notion of foundation "risk taking," they are not likely to romanticize it. What we must all do—even the most imaginative and venturesome—is to work from the center of certainty to (and somewhat beyond) the outer fringe of "reasonable risk." Imaginative administrators in every field reach into and beyond the fringe of "reasonable risk." There is no administrative work which does not involve chance-taking. College presidents and deans know this better than anyone else. All that foundations can do is reach well beyond most organizations into this area of risk. Furthermore they can reach into it as a normal operating policy instead of only occasionally, and they can risk greater sums on it. In this sense—and it is a very real sense—the foundations are indeed engaged in supplying "risk capital." They do indeed have a unique role. But this does not alter the fact that the risks which they take are really only a few steps beyond those that any good administrator takes. They are different in *extent* and *frequency* but not in kind.

Still another matter on which the dean or president will instinctively understand the problems of the foundation officer is in the difficult process of dealing with creative people. It is most decidedly true that foundations seek to deal with creative people. They seek to be alert to creativity and to nurture it. But again this differs from certain other kinds of educational administration only in extent and not in kind. Every academic administrator spends part of his time identifying and nurturing creativity. The foundation officer spends more of his time on this activity but it is not an essentially different task.

The role of the foundation officer in nurturing creativity sometimes leads to the supposition that he himself should be a creative person. Every college administrator will recognize that this does not necessarily follow. The processes involved in identifying and nurturing creativity are not necessarily themselves of a highly creative nature. Indeed, some thoroughly routine kinds of programs may be of immense benefit to the

creative man. Often the creative man needs a good housekeeper more than anything else in the world. He will supply the creativity if more ordinary mortals will meet lesser needs. I mention this because some critics of foundations, in looking at programs of grants, have made the mistake of believing that those programs which *seemed* the most provocative, exciting or imaginative were necessarily the most creative in final outcome. This is not the case. A program may look very dull indeed but if it supplies creative men with something that they need in order to do what they must do, then it is a good program.

One final problem which the college dean or president will understand instantly is the ancient question of whether in giving out support you should "play to strength" or "build strength." Should you give money to the men or institutions whose distinction and present strength are such that they are certain to use it effectively or even brilliantly? Or should you give money to those who lack that present strength and distinction but who may nonetheless get more out of the grant than the stronger party? Every college president or dean who has struggled with departmental budgets has faced this problem. The strong department will use the money more competently but the weak department needs it more. And the educational administrator knows that there is no simple answer to this dilemma. He avoids rigid doctrines and brings to each individual case what wisdom he can muster.

Now it is true that there are a few problems the foundation encounters which may not necessarily be met in the normal business of college and university administration. But most of these additional problems will be thoroughly familiar to any president or dean who has had the fortune or misfortune to handle the distribution of free research funds within his institution. The distribution of such funds, even though very limited in extent, will involve the administrator in almost every problem of foundation policy. Many presidents and deans have had this experience and they will know what I mean. They will find no difficulty in understanding, for example, the controversial question of whether you should concentrate your grants in a few large chunks to achieve maximum impact or should scatter small grants as widely as possible. If the college president,

administering his modest research funds, gives the money in large chunks to the two or three most distinguished faculty members, outsiders may praise him for the results achieved but not all insiders will vote for him in the next popularity contest. On the other hand, if he scatters small grants as widely as possible throughout the faculty, he may improve the morale of a good many people but there will be those who accuse him of dissipating the money or, to use the term familiar in the foundation field, of "scatteration." This again is an insoluble problem and no good dean, president or foundation officer ever really believes that he will solve it.

Again, the college president or dean in charge of a free research fund for faculty members will promptly encounter the difficulties centering around grants of indefinite tenure. With a limited fund, how long can he continue to support a single faculty member? If others are to have their chance, the grant must have a definite term and usually a fairly brief term. This is the only means of keeping the funds reasonably free over the years. But this line of reasoning will seem highly abstract to the professor whose grant is cut off.

The dean or president will discover many other things with his free research fund. He will encounter good ideas in the hands of men who lack the technical skill to carry them through. He will encounter good men in unfortunate contexts—in unsympathetic departmental situations for example—which prevent them from carrying through anything successfully. He will find that personalities, working relationships and many other factors affect his judgment. And he will discover the most painful reality of foundation operations—that there is never, never enough money to go around.

The final aspect of foundation policy which I wish to mention, and this again is one which will be readily understood by college presidents, is the extraordinary steps which the best foundations have traditionally taken to insure wise stewardship of the large sums under their control. The first safeguard is the board of trustees. Each of the major foundations has a board of trustees of national stature, of absolutely unquestioned integrity and of wide experience in American life. These trustees have the final power to hire or fire any officer of the foundation, to

establish or alter any of the major operating policies, to determine the fields in which the foundation is to operate, and to take any other major policy action which seems necessary. The existence of a vital, interested, distinguished and widely known board of trustees is an immensely important means of rooting the foundation in American life and guaranteeing that it will function under the supervision of acknowledged leaders in our national life.

The next safeguard is "full disclosure." Every major foundation takes wholly extraordinary measures to conduct all of its operations in a goldfish bowl. The Carnegie Corporation lists every stock which it buys or sells. It lists every grant which it makes. It publishes an annual report. It publishes quarterly reports. It issues regular news releases. The officers of the Corporation will answer any questions concerning the foundation which are asked by a responsible person. Other major foundations follow a similar policy. They make a fetish of their public accountability and regard "full disclosure" as the central instrument of such accountability. There have surely been few instances in American life of such elaborate institutional measures to operate openly and with all of the cards face up.

The final safeguard is the extensive arrangements which the good foundation makes for obtaining outside advice. Every foundation officer must build up an extraordinarily broad acquaintance. He is forever traveling, forever interviewing people, forever questioning them, forever seeking their judgments. The major foundations retain paid consultants; they call together committees to advise them; they turn to one or another organization for advice and inevitably they get a good deal of free advice, some of it unsought. The capacity to seek out and obtain good advice is one of the first requirements of the young foundation officer. He learns how to seek out good men, to identify the ones who will be honest and candid with him, the ones who will be shrewd in their judgment of others, the ones full of interesting and valuable ideas. All of this is a normal part of sound foundation operations. The foundation will never seek to shirk responsibility for its decisions, but it will always seek to build those decisions upon a sound base of verified judgment.

I have gone to these lengths to describe some of the operating

policy problems of foundations because, for reasons which are not clear to me, the policies which must govern foundation operations have seemed mysterious to outsiders. There is nothing mysterious about them. They are for the most part the policies which must govern all educational administration. They appear in a somewhat novel form but they are not unique.

There is however another and deeper reason behind this exposition. Putting it very simply, it is my earnest hope that the growing alliance between foundations and the colleges and universities will be steadily strengthened and that it will be characterized by mutual respect and confidence. As I have said, it has been my experience that the administrative officers of colleges and universities do not find it difficult to understand foundation operations and that foundation officers find it easy to sympathize with educational administrators. Yet there have been instances of misunderstanding. I sincerely hope and believe such instances will diminish in frequency and that foundation officers and educational administrators will find it increasingly easy to recognize one another as steadfast and worthy allies.

TEACHING: A TEACHER'S APPRAISAL

BYRON K. TRIPPET

PRESIDENT, WABASH COLLEGE

LIKE many another college dean and president, I began as a teacher. I continued to think of myself primarily as a teacher when I abandoned a life of scholarship to become a dean. Even now when I am about to abandon academic life altogether to become a college president I find myself thinking about teaching in much the same way as I did years ago when I was meeting four different classes three times a week. I suppose something like this must be the case with all deans and presidents who began as I did—teaching for the love of teaching—and who then gradually became college administrators. It may be that such a person in the educational system is qualified to appraise good teaching. At least he should be qualified to appraise poor teaching. The incidence and example of poor teaching are so much more plentiful in his experience. But the hazard in this assumption is that it overlooks the possibility that what often passes for informed judgment about teaching on the part of an academic dean or president is really a nostalgic expression of what he once imagined himself to be as a teacher.

How can a college dean or a college president as he broods about the problems of his faculty and his students be confident in his appraisal of effective teaching? About those few professors whose gifts of intelligence, learning, character and personality are so clear that the lives of their colleagues and their students readily attest to their greatness, a dean can be reasonably sure. To a lesser degree perhaps he can be sure of his judgments about those teachers whose gifts in the same areas are so limited that they create repeated problems for students and fellow teachers. But how can a dean or a president be sure about the great majority of teachers who fall somewhere between these two extremes?

One way which is very fashionable these days is to rely on student opinion. An alert dean or president can become aware of a teacher's popularity or unpopularity as he listens to students' problems and complaints. And there are all kinds of

ways, formal and informal, for doing this. If he listens carefully enough and checks his impressions with student rating sheets, he can even catalogue the elements which make a teacher popular or unpopular. But there are serious pitfalls here. Popularity and unpopularity, we all know, are not necessarily indications of good or bad teaching. Even if elaborate precautions are taken to eliminate factors of popularity and unpopularity—an exceedingly difficult undertaking at best—there may still remain elements of doubt. If a teacher fares badly over the years by the test of majority student opinion but nevertheless by his influence changes the lives of a handful of students in the direction of greatness, what shall we say of his worth as a teacher?

Another way of appraising teaching, also fashionable at the moment, is to try to measure the performance of students while in college and afterward too. An industrious dean who likes statistical studies can try to appraise teaching effectiveness in terms of standardized test results, of graduate school records, and even of the long-range professional advancement of men and women who were once undergraduate students. But the difficulty here—at least for me—is that, despite the apparent objectivity of such techniques, one can never be quite certain whether one is judging the qualities of the students or the qualities of the men and women who teach them. We are all familiar with examples of men and women distinguished in adult life for their wisdom and their goodness who were graduated from colleges with thoroughly undistinguished faculties. We are all aware also, I suppose, of the teacher who stands quietly in the shadow of more prominent and aggressive colleagues but who years later turns out somehow to be remembered with marked affection and esteem by returning alumni. The frequency with which the sort of thing illustrated by these two examples happens has made me increasingly wary of trying to appraise by supposedly objective standards the effectiveness of teachers and their teaching—except over a long period of time. Unfortunately, when a long period of time has elapsed, it is difficult to make much practical use of the final appraisal.

Now it may sound to you as if I am simply making a case for the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of making valid appraisals of effective teaching. In a way I am—at least for that great

middle group of teachers who are not clearly and obviously great teachers or clearly and obviously poor teachers. But in spite of this I do have a thought or two which may be worth reflecting about as we wrestle with this perennial problem.

First it seems to me worth-while to observe, at least in the small and moderate-size liberal arts college, the extent to which a teacher understands, and identifies his teaching with, the ultimate and total ends which the college seeks to serve. Does he know what the whole college as a place of learning is trying to do and why it is trying to do it? Is he himself in general agreement with the educational aims of the liberal arts and deeply committed to them? Is he a good intellectual companion for students and fellow teachers alike outside of his particular discipline? If the answer to these questions is yes, then here may be a teacher who is worth his weight in gold, whether he is a productive scholar or not and despite the fact that he may be unknown in professional circles off his own campus. And his weight in gold in this sense might be borne in mind when it comes to salary improvement, recognition and promotion.

Secondly it might often help us in appraising our faculties, again with the undergraduate liberal arts college in mind, if we would apply to our appraisals a few of the classical pronouncements on the role of teaching. I have in mind, for example, such sentences as that of Cardinal Newman's which says in effect that the function of the teacher is not to enlarge the sum total of the world's knowledge but to communicate it. The teacher who thinks of his mission as primarily that of communicating what he knows and thinks to his students and doing so with relevance and meaning for their lives may not progress professionally along the more narrow lines that the competitive compulsions of professional advancement now unfortunately require, but he may nevertheless in the long run serve his college richly. Such a teacher is likely to be humble about the limitations of his own knowledge and acutely aware of his own experience of learning and growing. He is likely therefore to continue his own general education in all directions as he teaches and to become a wiser teacher in the process. Has this not frequently been true of some of the world's greatest teachers, like Socrates and Jesus, who left nothing behind them in writing except as their students

have recorded their wisdom and their vision? This is a quality of mind which is difficult to maintain in American higher education, what with the inordinate emphasis we have placed on the narrowness of learning in the production of Ph.D's. Especially in the humanities, but also in the social studies and the precise sciences, it is a rare quality in young teachers worth looking for and worth encouraging with financial rewards and promotions when we find it.

In this connection may I betray my own bias by remarking that I never fail to be impressed with the way in which the English have for a long time been able to achieve extraordinarily high standards of scholarship and research in their universities on the part of young teachers without the tradition of advanced degrees formally earned? As we grapple with the problem of teacher shortages in the immediate future, it is worth reflecting, I believe, that the majority of eminent scholars in England have earned only the A.B. degree. This is particularly true in the humanities and the social studies but to a large extent in the natural sciences as well. They are usually excellent teachers as well as productive scholars, and despite their specialities in the university community they are remarkably broad in their learning and their interests. Behind this situation is a long tradition that teaching, learning, and research, thinking, speaking and writing, are inseparable ingredients in a way of life for all members of an academic community. It is a way of life and growth taken for granted rather than formalized, measured and appraised by levels of graduate degrees and quantities of papers published.

I cannot help wondering whether some of the difficulties we shall encounter as we try to meet teacher shortages are not a part of the price American higher education must pay for having adopted in the closing decades of the 19th century the German rather than the English model of scholarship and learning.

Feeling as I do about this, I would naturally suggest that as we appoint, appraise and promote new teachers in the decade ahead of us we might do well to reconsider the presuppositions on which appraisals of learning and scholarship now rest.

Finally may I suggest—or perhaps merely remind you—that in appraising a teacher it is well to observe the extent to which

he touches the lives of students outside the classroom as well as in. The really good teacher never stops teaching in the broadest sense. Almost unconsciously he brings his interests, his learning, his experience, his character—indeed all of his gifts—to bear whenever he is in the company of young people. Contact between student and teacher in nonacademic but still typically collegiate circumstances often proves to be from the student's point of view a decisive influence in his life. Such aspects of teaching and their value are admittedly difficult to measure. But one thing is certain. If a teacher has no companionship with students outside the classroom and the laboratory the full extent of his potential as a teacher is not realized.

What I have said amounts, I suppose, to saying that in appraising good teachers we must start by appraising their quality as human beings. As in other professions, the good teacher is first of all a good man or a good woman. Therefore, we need to look beyond and beneath the external marks of the teacher as a professional. In a way we should appraise them in terms of their amateur standing. As amateurs they teach for the love of teaching and learning. They teach for the love of their own quest of truth, beauty and goodness and for the joy it gives them to share this adventure with others. Under such teachers in mathematics and science young people learn to seek truth. Under such teachers in history they learn to seek truth and goodness. Under such teachers in literature they learn to seek truth, goodness and beauty. I take it that, in theory at least, we would all agree that liberal arts colleges are in the truth-goodness-and-beauty business. If this is true, then these are the amateur qualities in teachers which we should look for and encourage when we find them.

We deans and presidents may shortly be forced to judge teachers as amateurs rather than professionals whether we want to or not. The pressure of increasing enrolments and the shortage of teachers may very well force us when we appoint or promote a teacher to alter our habits in appraising strength and weakness. Indeed I hope so. If this happens and we appraise teaching in the dimensions I have suggested, it presupposes that we who judge are ourselves well and broadly educated, that we ourselves are seekers of truth, goodness and beauty. Perhaps therefore we should begin by a reappraisal of ourselves.

TEACHING: A STUDENT'S APPRAISAL

MILLARD SUSMAN

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

FOR a student, there is a special thrill in having an opportunity to tell a group of educators how they ought to be handling their affairs. I hope that I have not used that opportunity simply to achieve the catharsis of my own four-year collection of suppressed classroom furies.

If I learned anything in freshman composition (and I think I did), it was to begin at the beginning and to state one's personal limitations and basic assumptions. The part about personal limitations can easily be summed up like this. I was asked to speak on the subject of "Teaching: A Student's Appraisal." The fact is that students don't appraise teaching: they appraise teachers. And although what I have to say today will probably sound naive, I can assure you that I am not so naive as to repeat here my appraisals of my teachers—however perceptive or witty I feel them to be. This then is an entirely new subject to me.

I suppose that the part of my freshman lesson which required stating the basic assumptions underlying a statement of opinion is going to make it necessary for me to tell the old story about the purposes of colleges, but it is a good old story, I think, and worthy of repetition.

The university at which I am a student sits rather majestically on a hill. From the east, or from certain spots to the north, it looks for all the world like a Renaissance castle, protected from the realities of the city by its many-treed landscape. At night, when there is sometimes a mist over its lawns, the campus is filled with a dream-like purple glow borrowed by the fog from the red granite walls of the buildings. And it is possible when looking at such a school to forget just how practical and vital its functions really are. But a college is in no sense isolated from the "realities" surrounding it and is hardly to be described as "dream-like."

A philosophy teacher I once had said that "the Greeks defined a liberal education as being the study of the only subjects fit for the consideration of a free man (politics, mathematics, philosophy

and so forth), whereas we have come to define it as the education that sets a man free." For the Greeks learning was rather a luxury: politics for them did not suggest the problems of "big" government, tariffs, parities, foreign aid, immigration, labor unions, the United Nations or McCarthy; mathematics did not suggest physics or engineering; differences of philosophy did not endanger the survival of every living thing. For us on the other hand life has not only become more complex but utterly incomprehensible to any single human mind. The public welfare is in the hands of experts in specific fields, not in the hands of "universal men" who can view and understand the whole and advise accordingly. Some of the most far-reaching actions of governments and some of the most significant contributions of scientists are based on such remote theoretical considerations and such unfamiliar logic and such specially-trained intuition that none of us can fully understand, much less control, all of the blessings and all of the curses with which government and science (to name only two fields) are constantly pelting us. Thus for us, certainly more than for the Greeks, ignorance is slavery and learning is, if not a grant of absolute freedom, at least a widening of the boundaries surrounding us. The more competent we are to judge and suggest, the more free we are to choose our destinies.

In a world then in which freedom is almost synonymous with education, the American college can consider itself to be the guardian and the guarantor of that freedom which we believe to be the most sacred and basic right of every individual. But the ability to choose, which we call freedom, is liable to be useless or even dangerous if it is not given some direction. Progress—regardless of what the magazine ads may say—is not a patented product of the General Electric Company. More generally and accurately it is to be attributed to the specialists who work in and issue from the college. And progress is not random change but change in some direction—toward improvement or perfection, whatever those terms might mean. If the American college is to fulfill its obligation to civilization, it must produce students who are competent, curious, and who, with all their freedom, are willing to cooperate with one another to produce not just a different world but a better one.

The problem facing the American college teacher is not what to do with the superior student, but rather how to develop every

student to his highest possible level of competence and curiosity and how to instill a spirit of cooperation.

Now what I have been leading up to all this time is simply this: the problem which I have most often seen defeat potentially fine teachers and reduce them to mediocrity is the problem of teaching a class in which there is such a diversity in the abilities of the students to grasp the material presented that to teach to the best students is to baffle the poorest and to teach to the poorest is to bore or to insult the best. I think it is unpractical to teach at a relatively low level and to hope that the superior student will go farther on his own—even the best student needs a push. And it is, by definition, not even teaching to aim a course at the best students and to let the less competent ones flounder. But the teaching process seems to me to reach a magnificent efficiency when a teacher can keep the whole class floundering.

This will probably sound strange coming from a pre-medical student, but I don't think that the classroom is any place for competition. It is an excellent place to learn the value of exchanging ideas and theories and criticisms, and that lesson just can't be learned if everyone is hiding his bibliography or hoarding his sudden insights or refusing to share the one fact he learned in such-and-such a course that makes all the difference in the world in understanding the problem at hand. I can tell you from rather recent experience that this "keep-them-all-floundering" approach to teaching, in which the material presented is just too voluminous and the problems presented are just too far-reaching to be conquered by even the best student, leads to a really healthy sharing of ideas—I do not mean cheating—I mean cooperation of the most and the least competent students in the class toward a common goal of understanding. In the class to which I refer, I think that we students have all learned how to work with others more effectively. And I think that we have learned how to sacrifice our own precious, inspired ideas and to replace them with more valid ones presented by our colleagues. The result is, I think, that we have taught ourselves and each other more in our joint efforts to keep from drowning than the teacher could ever have hoped to teach us on his own.

The keep-them-floundering method has another advantage. Text books and class notes are memorized with considerable difficulty but forgotten with the greatest of ease. Teaching facts is

less important than teaching how to find the facts and how to use them once you have found them. Obviously the best way to teach all this is to expect the student to exhibit an acquaintance with and an understanding of much more information than he is given in class.

Furthermore the "progress" I spoke of before arises not only out of knowing the facts but also out of asking questions. And what better way is there to produce competent curiosity than to confront the student with enormous but fascinating questions? I had a wise and wonderful English teacher in high school who would let us wrestle with one of the eternal problems that were just beginning to bother us for just a long enough time that we should never forget our opponent, and then she'd say: "That, my dears, is part of your homework for the next forty years." Well, I'm still doing her homework assignments, not because the questions can not be ignored but simply because they can not be forgotten. In addition, the process of attacking huge questions consists simply of asking the right "sub-questions"; it is good practice. I think therefore that if I were teaching, I would grade a student more on the questions he asks and on the industry he exhibits in attempting to solve the apparently insoluble than on his ability to feed back facts—because the student who excels in those traits will be the truly valuable citizen of the future. But, of course, it is harder to be that kind of teacher.

That, I guess, brings me to my last paragraph. I read in freshman German that *Fleißiger Schueler macht fleissigen Lehrer*—an industrious student makes an industrious teacher. Well, it works the other way around too. Henry David Thoreau said: "I have never yet met a man who was quite awake. How could I have looked him in the face?" The answer seems simple enough. For teachers who are not quite awake, I must admit that I have developed the ability to keep my eyes open and look attentive while—well, not asleep—but in a state of profound relaxation. But I find that to face a teacher who is really awake—who is aware of the enormous questions suggested by his field of study and who is trying with all his strength to solve them—I find that, to face such a teacher, the only choice I have is to wake up. That is to say, if a teacher wants to keep his class floundering, he'd better flounder a little himself.

REDISCOVERING THE FOUNDING FATHERS

LYMAN H. BUTTERFIELD

EDITOR IN CHIEF, *The Adams Papers*

I. Changing Styles in Celebrating Our Past

EARLY in the 19th century, when the American people, for various reasons, first became self-conscious about their historical past, they began paying tribute to the virtues and wisdom of their forefathers in a number of distinct ways.

One of these ways was of course by public assemblages on important anniversaries. The principal feature of these celebrations was always a patriotic address by an ex-general or member of Congress who did justice to the occasion by talking for a few hours to an audience that must have had far greater stamina than their descendants of today.

But oratory is ephemeral, and patriotic Americans soon felt an urge to memorialize their heroes in forms more durable and imposing. The Age of Monuments began in the second quarter of the 19th century, and its most conspicuous survivals are known to all of you. New England led the way with the organization of the Bunker Hill Monument Association in 1823. Though no less a figure than Lafayette laid the cornerstone in 1825, the way of the public-spirited sponsors was not smooth. There were those like Caleb Stark of Vermont who said that the Revolutionary veterans were being given a stone instead of bread. Professor Everett wanted a Grecian column but Judge Story insisted on an Egyptian obelisk, and their contention divided the sponsors into hostile camps. Fund-collecting lagged until a "Ladies' Fair" raised \$30,000, and at last in 1843 the dedication took place, with Daniel Webster as orator and "His Accidency" President John Tyler in attendance. Thousands swooned with delight under the influence of Webster's rolling periods but John Quincy Adams was not one of them. He stayed home in Quincy that day. He had watched the original battle of Bunker Hill with his mother from a hill above their home south of Boston, and he considered all the ostentation and "spouting" and "swilling" of 1843 a burlesque of New England ideals, a cheap political maneuver by which Webster hoped to work his way into the

White House. In his Diary he irreverently wondered which was longer—the Monument in Charlestown or John Tyler's nose.

The Washington Monument in the District of Columbia was fifty years or more a-building and has its own entertaining history. There have been later, highly appropriate monuments to other Presidents. But on the whole, and I think fortunately, the Age of Monuments is over. Certainly the demise of the recently agitated plan for a granite "Hall of Our History" in the Georgia pine barrens is a good thing. Monuments are static: they look backward rather than forward; they evoke sentiment but can hardly induce knowledge or understanding. To gape at is not to know.

A more living type of memorial began to replace stone monuments toward the close of the last century. This is the shrine—as it stands or as reconstructed—commemorating a great historical event or the life of a great man. Contrast, from the standpoint of what can be learned from them, Bunker Hill Monument and the Yorktown Battlefield as restored by the National Park Service. Or contrast the early work of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities on Jamestown Island with the more recent archeological work of the National Park Service at that historic site. We shall be forever indebted to the amateur organization that saved the famous island from total loss to the public, but we must hope at the same time that the methods of modern archeology and scientific restoration will prevail more widely.

They are of course spreading. We now have whole communities restored, reconstructed or assembled. Colonial Williamsburg is the biggest and most spectacular but more and more projects of this kind are announced every year. In 1955 Mr. Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr., issued a volume called "The Living Past of America," described as "a pictorial treasury of the historic houses and villages where America's past has been preserved," and containing a "national directory" of scores of "historic preservations" in all parts of the country.

Three-quarters of a million people visited Colonial Williamsburg in 1954. The operating budget of this organization is about the same as that of Princeton University. These figures indicate that history, in this form at least, is certainly big business in the United States today. Do they also indicate that Americans have

a boundless hunger to know more and more about their origins? Or are they, in peering around at the quaint homes, crafts and relics of their forebears, simply indulging in a mild cultural diversion that fits in well with their multiple urges to be always on the move, to spend money lavishly and to take no end of pictures? These are questions that the directors and curators of historic preservations constantly ponder, because their responsibility to see that something significant emerges from this mass phenomenon is an almost frighteningly serious one.

II. *Publication of Historical Records*

The third way by which we have paid tribute to "the fathers" is by the publication of documents that embody their deeds and sayings. Foreign observers have often noted that, to use the words of one of them, "America is the only country in the world which pretends to listen to the teaching of its founders as if they were still alive. Political battles of today are fought with arguments based on the speeches and writings of men dead over a century ago. Most Americans behave, in fact, as if men like Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson and many others could be called up on the phone for advice."

This is only a slight exaggeration, and the habit seems to have been early ingrained in us. The American Revolution had not even begun when an enterprising bookseller named Ebenezer Hazard began collecting materials for a great compilation of historical documents that would provide the evidence and arguments that Americans would need to carry on the struggle in their public forums. It was many years before Hazard's *Historical Collections* appeared, but when it did Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson gave it a warm endorsement, saying that he had found these "curious monuments of the infancy of our country" of great interest and the idea of publishing them highly commendable. "Time and accident are committing daily havoc on the originals . . .," said Jefferson. "The lost cannot be recovered, but let us save what remains; not by vaults and locks which fence them from the public eye and use in consigning them to the waste of time, but by such a multiplication of copies as shall place them beyond the reach of accident."

Jefferson here stated the principles that have animated a whole race of laborious drudges, called historical editors, ever since.

I have written elsewhere about the major 19th-century figures in this great and, as I believe, honorable tradition: the men who founded historical societies for the purpose of gathering in and publishing historical records of all sorts; the great private collectors like Peter Force, who nearly bankrupted himself accumulating books, pamphlets, manuscripts and newspapers in order to compile his *American Archives* in nine-folio volumes; the astute Jared Sparks, who made the first canvass of colonial records in the thirteen original states and brought out a long series of statesmen's papers that made possible the first respectable histories of our country.

The shortcomings of the work of these early giants in the field are only too obvious today. Their motives were profoundly filio-pietistic: they were celebrating the virtues of the colonists, the struggles of the Revolutionary generation, the perils and feats of the frontiersmen. These motives were commendable enough in themselves but they carried over into editorial methods with sometimes unfortunate results. Sparks went so far, for example, as to suppress or alter passages in Washington's letters that were not in accord with the prevailing myth that the Father of his Country was an absolutely faultless man. It was not long before these manipulations were discovered and pointed out. Sparks was defended by those who maintained that to reveal a founding father's small faults of temperament or language was equivalent to the body-snatching then necessary for anatomical study. But he was criticized for presenting all his subjects, as Charles Francis Adams wrote, in "a uniform of grave hue, which, though it doubtless exalts the opinion entertained of their perfections, somewhat diminishes the interest with which later generations study their character." To summarize a long development, the course of historical editing during the century since Sparks laid down his pen has been an ever-closer approximation of *the full record just as it stands* in the manuscript originals.

A portent of great significance appeared at the beginning of the present century when the late J. Franklin Jameson took up his duties as director of the Department of Historical Research in the newly founded Carnegie Institution of Washington. Jameson had a vision, subsequently carried out far better than most men's visions are, of a far-flung attack on the masses of unexploited historical material in our own government archives

(then scattered in a hundred different departmental offices and warehouses) and also—here he was even more visionary—on the materials for American history buried in the archival repositories of all the nations of Europe. Soon afterward appeared the first of the long series of “Carnegie Guides” to American and European archives that a whole generation of scholars has thumbed and rethumbed in their search for high-quality ore. Seldom have they failed to find it. Jameson also launched a series of documentary publications, partly based on the searches his staff was conducting in new fields. The most remarkable of these is Edmund C. Burnett’s *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, published in eight volumes from 1921 to 1938, which enormously extends our knowledge of the men and measures of the first years of this nation. Burnett was a kind of editors’ editor, as Edmund Spenser is said to be a poets’ poet. He did not try to answer all the questions that the documents he published raise. No editor can do that and get on with his job. But he provided the right kind of clues for those who, studying the documents, need or want to answer questions they raise.

More recently a number of editions of presidential papers have been completed, widely varying in their scope. The bicentennial anniversary of George Washington’s birth was recognized by a government-sponsored edition of Washington’s *Writings* in 41 volumes edited by John C. Fitzpatrick (1931–1944). Textually admirable, this work suffers from a poor physical format and scanty annotation—presumably because the congressional appropriations were not generous enough and the editor was forced to cut the cloth he had. From the point of view of the historical connoisseur, the *Collected Works* of Lincoln, issued by the Abraham Lincoln Association of Springfield under the editorship of Roy P. Basler (9 vols., 1953–1955), is a more satisfactory job; indeed the editorial work and physical design are both superlatively good, though again only writings *by* Lincoln are included without even a selection of the letters he received. Just completed also is the selective edition of Theodore Roosevelt’s *Letters* (8 vols., 1951–1954), edited by Elting Morison and containing 6,500 of the approximately 150,000 known letters written by one of the most lively and entertaining letter-writers in the annals of literature.

The progress of historical editing in the last century is no-

where better illustrated, however, than in the great Princeton edition of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (1950-), of which twelve of an estimated 50 volumes have so far appeared. The editor, Mr. Julian P. Boyd, has set new standards in his methods of gathering in vast masses of pertinent material from repositories all over the world, in his skill in organizing the assembled materials for use, and in the care and thoroughness of his presentation of the Jeffersonian documentation. He early decided that the letters and papers received by Jefferson had to be taken as fully into account as the statesman's own writings, because Jefferson throughout his long and useful life was in touch with scholars and scientists and inventors and philosophers and literary men and artists and educators as well as with politicians and diplomats and generals. The result is that, as the volumes appear, we are finding in them not simply a record of one man's life and thoughts but an encyclopedia of his age.

But greater inclusiveness is not the only striking feature of Mr. Boyd's editing. He has followed the principle of gathering in and comparing all discoverable texts of the documents he edits, so that we can rely on what he prints as the very best possible rendering of the originals in all their versions. He has also furnished the locations of all the manuscripts he has found, so that a meticulous student, if he feels he needs to, can go behind the printed versions to the originals. And he has listed, and in important cases summarized or printed in full, the enclosures that accompanied letters written by or to Jefferson. (Enclosures are sometimes more important than their covering letters.) In a word, Mr. Boyd has greatly enlarged the sphere of editorial responsibility in scholarly publishing, greatly to the benefit of those who use his edition.

The comprehensiveness and the editorial excellence of the *Jefferson* have made us realize how inadequately the work of documenting the American past has been performed up to this point, despite the numerous editions of the founding fathers' writings that burden library shelves. This realization has led to the launching in the past few years of a series of other editorial enterprises on the same grand scale. Franklin's papers are now being assembled at Yale by a corps of scholarly editors representing both Yale and the American Philosophical Society. They expect to publish 25 or 30 volumes, which will include the

letters Franklin received. Alexander Hamilton is being similarly honored by his alma mater, Columbia University. The Adamses—that is, the three successive generations of Adams statesmen and their highly articulate wives and other connections—are being taken care of, most appropriately, by the Massachusetts Historical Society and the Harvard University Press under its new imprint, the Belknap Press. We can count on announcements of further ventures of the same kind in the near future. As one of my fellow editors remarked to me a little while ago, we are witnessing a trend that the public may eventually recognize as “almost important.”

One of the unquestionably important things about it is the variety of the sponsorship of these enterprises. Universities and colleges, historical and other learned societies are among the sponsors. Funds have come from expected but more often unexpected sources. The Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt projects have been subsidized by memorial foundations with primary interest in the figures concerned. The large philanthropic foundations—traditional sources of support for scholarly undertakings on a large scale—have however been hesitant and have had only a very small part in these undertakings. The *Jefferson* is supported from funds given by The New York Times Company as a memorial to Adolph Ochs. No fewer than three of the most recently announced enterprises (the *Franklin*, *Adams* and *Hamilton*) are obtaining all or a large part of their editorial funds from Time, Inc. This too might be described as a trend that is “almost important.” In the case of *The Adams Papers*, funds are provided under the terms of a contract that permits *Life* magazine to print serially, in advance of book publication, such selected materials as the editors of *Life* believe will have maximum interest for their vast readership. In other words the editors of *Life* are convinced, and have backed up their conviction with large sums of money, that the actual stuff of American History has a strong and direct appeal to the mass reading public. To an historian this can only be good news and of course the strongest kind of incentive to prove that this is really so.

III. *The Adams Papers: Some Highlights*

There is nothing boastful in the claim that *The Adams Papers* is the largest of these scholarly enterprises so far announced or

likely to be announced in the future. Its magnitude would, I believe, humble the most self-confident editor and it certainly does me. As they stand on the shelves, the family papers amount to some 300,000 pages of manuscript material covering exactly two and a half centuries, from 1639 to 1889 (for we have to find a cut-off date somewhere and are fixing it at the passing of the third generation from the scene). Disregarding the scattered early bits, the papers deal with subjects as far apart as the French and Indian War and the political battles of the Garfield-Cleveland era, and with the whole vast sweep of American life in between: with the exciting issues that precipitated the Revolution; the deliberations of the Continental Congress; the negotiation of foreign loans, alliances and at length peace; the launching of the new government in 1789; the succession of international and internal crises in the closing years of the century; the great issues of the Louisiana Purchase and neutrality by embargo; the defection of New England (fiercely deplored by all the Adamses) during "Mr. Madison's War"; the peace that ended that war (a negotiation in which John Quincy Adams strikingly repeated the success of his father in Paris 30 years earlier); the establishment of United States policy in the Western Hemisphere by the Monroe Doctrine (of which John Quincy Adams was a principal author); the Clay-Adams program of internal improvements; the expansion of the nation to continental proportions, complicated by the slavery issue that could finally be no longer compromised and brought on the Civil War; that war itself, in both its military and diplomatic aspects; and the industrial expansion, problems of reconstruction and partisan struggles that followed the victory of the North.

These are broad descriptive terms and give no idea of how the collection looked physically when the editor began, late in 1954, his surveying and organizing operations that still continue. The Adamses were by nature and training a record-keeping tribe. One generation after another of them found themselves in strategic posts of observation in the United States and Europe, and they wrote down what they saw, thought and heard—in the form of diaries for their own reading and in letters for others to read. Unquestionably they felt the hand of destiny on their shoulders. How could they help it? Henry Adams recalled in his *Education* an incident in his childhood when the

old Irish gardener at Quincy said to him: "You'll be thinkin' you'll be President too!" Henry "could not remember ever to have thought on the subject" before that time; "to him, that there should be a doubt of his being President was a new idea." And so the Adamses filled the pages of their journals and commonplace books; they trained themselves in Latin and French and Dutch and Spanish and German by translating the European classics; they polished their style by writing verse; from an early age they began contributing reviews and travel letters and political articles to magazines and newspapers. Soon they were delivering patriotic addresses and lyceum lectures on topics of the day, and from there they went on to pamphlets and books. Everything they wrote they of course saved, and so did their children after them. The accumulation of papers at the Old House at a certain point in the 19th century began to crowd out the human occupants. Additions were built and finally, after the Civil War, a separate stone library was erected to serve as a family muniment room. The first Charles Francis Adams grappled manfully with his problems as family archivist and editor, binding up masses of correspondence from time to time and editing substantial bodies of materials selected from the papers of his grandfather John, his grandmother Abigail, and his father, John Quincy. Charles Francis died in 1886; his sons were occupied with other concerns; though several of them at different times undertook or promoted schemes to do justice to the family papers, they finally resorted to a device that would defer action to a later generation. This was the establishment of a trust for the custodianship of the papers for 50 years. For most of the years that the trust has existed scholars have murmured and complained about the trustees' policy of excluding virtually everyone from a sight of the family archives, but that policy has now been reversed and a program of microfilming the entire body of material for distribution, by subscription, to more than 20 libraries throughout the United States is now going on. This publication will of course relieve the editor of having to put into type very large quantities of relatively unimportant material such as account books, school exercises, epic poems, comedies written for amateur production, and the like. He can in other words be selective without incurring the usual criticism of selective editing—that the work omits the very things that

some specialist wants. Theoretically, everyone ought to be happy with the tripartite scheme of publication that has been worked out for *The Adams Papers*. The scholars will have everything on film; the readers of *Life* will have the highspots in their favorite magazine; and the few old-fashioned people who still prefer book pages to either coated paper or coated film will have what seems to me as I look ahead an almost endless series of books to read.

No brief description of the papers will convey much of a notion of their extent, variety and richness. But some little account of the most spectacular single document in the collection may be suggestive. This is the Diary of John Quincy Adams, a colossal record in 50 manuscript volumes of a public career that upon study appears itself to be more and more truly colossal. It is doubtful if there exists anywhere another personal journal that can compare with this one in the fidelity with which it was kept over a period of 70 years (1779-1848). For 60 of these years there are virtually no breaks whatever in the record; that is, there are 365 entries a year (in leap years 366). Sometimes, to be sure, it proved impossible in the press of his affairs for Adams to get down more than a line or two a day, or a few rough notes listing the persons he saw and conversed with; but the notes were preserved and eventually bound up in a series of volumes to which the diarist gave the title "Rubbish," and they fill the gaps that infrequently occur in the fully written-up record.

The manuscript volumes themselves attest the heroic character of Adams' struggle to maintain this fabulous record, in sickness and in health, in times of triumph and despair, at home, in the capitals of Europe, or traveling by land or sea. The most poignant passage in the whole body of *The Adams Papers* that I know is a single sentence under the date 30 September 1845, written in a tremulous and nearly illegible hand, reading: "Quincy. Tuesday. 30 September 1845. IV: 30 [the time of his arising]. From this time the total disability to write with my own hand compels me to discontinue the daily journal of my life." The remainder of the entries, with the exception of one interval, are in the hands of various granddaughters and other amanuenses, though they are maintained after a fashion to within a few

weeks of the old man's death at his post of duty on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Though he characterized the Diary as "a multiplication of books to no end and without end," and his devotion to it the main reason why he had done nothing of real importance for his country, the Diary itself is actually one of the major accomplishments of Adams' life. Though his efforts to maintain it, he said, were "like the race of a man with a wooden leg after a horse," he would not give it up, and he reproached himself bitterly for whole pages when he allowed arrears to accumulate. Once the whole Adams family missed a steamboat from New York to Boston because Papa was engrossed in getting up his journal of events that had so far occurred during the trip from Washington. Another time, as a very old man, he slipped on the floor-matting of the House chamber and dislocated his right shoulder, but he was not only in his seat the next day, to the astonishment and chagrin of his adversaries, but had written up the accident in his Diary, commenting that since it was "the business and duty" of his life to write, he considered such "occasional disabilities" as acts of Providence designed to teach him "fortitude and resignation."

There speaks the true John Quincy Adams, a man whose powers of self-discipline were such as to terrify ordinary mortals and whose physical stamina and dedication to moral principle enabled him again and again to stand off the whole House, as a grizzly stands off a pack of yelping dogs, when he thought he was in the right. One politician who had tangled with him and had been worsted, said afterwards that a man "must be a born fool . . . who voluntarily engages in a controversy with Mr. Adams." In the first place, he has such a tenacious memory that he has seldom if ever been mistaken about anything that has happened in his long lifetime. "And then, if he happens to be in doubt about anything, he has his inevitable diary, in which he has recorded everything that has occurred since the adoption of the Federal Constitution."

I doubt if there exists any more informative and useful single document for the study of the American past than John Quincy Adams' Diary. Among countless other matters of less consequence, the full publication of the text will illuminate three

major areas of our history: the foundations of our foreign policy, of which Adams, as Professor Bemis has shown, was the master builder; the maintenance of the right of popular petition, as a result of Adams' eight-year struggle against the Southern "gag rules" in the House of Representatives in the 1830's and 40's; and the beginnings of a true partnership between government and science, as symbolized in the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution, for the betterment of the lives of all Americans. It will also place before everyone who can read a faithful and moving record of the life of an indomitable fighter for the right.

IV. *Some Opportunities*

In this rapid review I have mentioned only a few large-scale enterprises in historical editing that have been recently completed or are in progress. Numerous others, large and small, could be mentioned and a good many more are in contemplation. But these merely suggest the opportunities in this area of scholarship, which appear to be more limitless now than ever before. We have become aware that the American people are by nature or habit a peculiarly record-keeping people, despite their mobility, despite fire, war and other agents of destruction (including human ones), and even despite our supposed preoccupation with mere getting and spending. Why this is so would make a good subject for another talk than this one. I personally suspect that the Adams family simply represents in an extreme form the history-consciousness of a people who originally crossed the ocean to a new and vast continent, conquered that continent with phenomenal speed, and felt that their novel and incredibly variegated experience was worth putting down just as it occurred. This is the only theory that accounts for the richness of American diary literature in general, from the original explorers to the Forty-Niners who, like J. G. Bruff, put wagon wheels on their nightly campfires on the Western plains and thus got light enough to write up their notes of each day's events. Bruff's own superb journal has only recently been discovered and published; so has the incomparable *Diary* of George Templeton Strong, a mid-19th-century Pepys of New York City. These are samples of the treasure that our forebears laid away for us to find, use and enjoy.

Important helps for this treasure-hunting operation are available. In the 1930's the Historical Records Survey, which was part of the professional program of the WPA, carried out a systematic ransacking of our national attic and basement. In the few years of its existence its workers inventoried some 8,000 local repositories of records in all 48 states and published hundreds of guides to the materials found. In the wake of the survey numerous regional repositories sprang up or greatly expanded their activities, so that there is no section of the country that now lacks adequate facilities and trained workers to gather in and care for family, business and institutional records. The establishment of the National Archives in 1934 also gave great impetus to the movement for rescuing and using the records of our past. It would be hard to overestimate the Archives' direct and indirect influence, though it is never publicized, in promoting archival programs in universities and colleges, religious organizations, business firms of long standing, railroads and the like. After all, what their records tell is very much a part of the American story, and only if these records are deployed for use can that story be told in any degree of fullness.

One of the most useful programs now going on under the aegis of the National Archives is that of the National Historical Publications Commission. Rehabilitated by President Truman in 1950 (as a direct upshot of his enthusiasm for the work being done on Jefferson at Princeton), it is a partnership of government and non-government historians designed to promote documentary publication in the field of American history. Its first public report, submitted to President Eisenhower in 1954, is entitled *A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents*. It is to me a thrilling document itself, and I commend it to all thoughtful citizens, including college presidents who want to encourage scholarship in their own history departments. For the report lists some 360 Americans, men and women, leaders in all fields of endeavor, the records of whose careers are available but have been inadequately published. Here are splendid opportunities for making important contributions to knowledge that can in many instances be carried out on the scholar's home ground. Recent developments in the field of microphotography make such projects more feasible than ever. For example, the

National Archives has microfilmed millions of pages of the federal records in its custody, and selected portions of the films in positive copy form can be obtained at very reasonable cost. In 1956, at long last, the basic series of records documenting our earliest history as a nation—the 400 volumes of the Papers of the Continental Congress (1774–1789) will be made available to historians, who have hitherto had to travel to Washington and go from one repository to another there, to consult the originals.

But amidst this vast and ever-growing accumulation of the raw materials of history, how does one find one's way? Curators and archivists who are beset with this problem are facing it with increasing resourcefulness. Two developments are especially noteworthy. A "National Register of Manuscript Collections" has been projected at the Library of Congress, with the aid of a large number of outside consultants, which will serve a function similar to the National Union Catalog of printed materials that has been developed in the past two or three decades. Rules for descriptive cataloguing of collections of manuscripts have been worked out, and it is confidently believed that custodians of manuscripts throughout the country will be willing and able, over a period of years, to furnish data on their holdings that can be printed and circulated just as Library of Congress cards for books long have been. The National Historical Publications Commission has nearly completed a less ambitious but potentially extremely valuable project that will be published in book form as a "Guide to Depositories of Manuscripts and Archives in the United States." I have had the privilege of examining some work sheets for this Guide and am ready to say that, when published, it will immensely facilitate research and editing in the field of American history. Thus I found information on manuscript holdings relating to the history of American science, law, religion, exploration, Indian relations, politics, literature and other subjects, in six or eight institutions in St. Louis alone, some of them wholly unknown to me before, that I would like to study here for weeks or more likely months.

I hope I have made clear my principal point—that the opportunities for fruitful labor in historical scholarship are unlimited and that many such opportunities lie right under the noses of those who will sniff the ground around them.

But, some may ask, why go on in this endless process of ex-

humming the past? Why is all this time, effort and money expended on a task that can never be finished? There are a number of answers to these questions but the effective ones are not simple. A brief answer is that of Cicero, who observed, I think rightly, that "Not to know what happened before one was born is always to be a child." A longer and very moving answer has been furnished by one of my fellow-editors, Roy P. Basler, who recently wrote in his foreword to *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*:

What editor who has undergone the drudgery of collecting, the disappointment of many a day's quest for illumination that would provide only a footnote, and the wearisome repetition of marking and remarking manuscript and proof sheets, has not asked himself the question: to what purpose this exact and exacting toil—the weighing of minutiae in a mountain? The insouciance with which journalists, politicians, and everyman in his sphere will misquote and misrepresent history will scarcely be altered permanently toward perfection by our work. Myth, both as lie and as poetry, will continue to accumulate around the symbolic figure of a great man. Even our zealous cudgeling of brains and harassing of attics must miss that which we do not know, or mistake that which we misunderstand.

To our question, two answers must suffice. First, the labor was its own reward. If the prophets of doom should be right and the evil forces never wholly absent from the world, ours would have been a large privilege, to survey more completely than any of our contemporaries, the slow and constant development of a great mind and personality oriented to the light in the midst of much darkness. Although the second answer is not of equal certainty, it embodies more of hope. It is that the record of past human effort, in failure and in success, in error and in truth, is the chief source from which mankind can draw an understanding of the meaning of the present and the hope of the future. To have helped in preserving an accurate record of a great man's work is a privilege of the present which the future can properly assess only by pledging itself in some degree to those principles of honesty, justice, and human brotherhood which will distinguish the writings of Lincoln as long as they are read.*

Mr. Basler has here spoken for all of us who are engaged in making our national treasure in the form of historical documents available to all who can read.

* Quoted with the kind permission of Mr. Basler and the Rutgers University Press. Copyright 1953 by The Abraham Lincoln Association.

LIBERAL EDUCATION: THE YEARS AHEAD

FRANC L. McCLUER
PRESIDENT, LINDENWOOD COLLEGE

LIBERAL education deals with ideas rather than techniques, with values rather than skills, with the eternal rather than the temporary. It seeks to acquaint the student with the chief areas of human thought and experience, to free him from ignorance, superstition and fear, to develop within him great intellectual curiosity and the power of reflective thought. The hope that our spiritual and humane insights may keep pace with our technological power rests on education of this character. Surely it is clear that our need for such education today—and tomorrow—is as great as it has ever been.

Liberal education is the handmaiden of the finest growth of the individual. However great our emphasis on social service, we dare not forget that a primary obligation of education is to discover, develop and release the powers of individual men and women. Education that cultivates these powers—of thought, of imagination and of judgment—not with reference to a specific task but for their own sake, is indispensable.

Some knowledge of the languages and literatures of the human race, some understanding of psychology and philosophy and religion, of the natural and the social sciences, of mathematics and history, bring an appreciation of the nature and destiny of man not to be acquired in any other way. The independent liberal arts college will justify the judgment of the late Chancellor George Throop of Washington University that this institution “untrammeled and unworried by the educationalism and fancies of the day may prove to be the best conservator of the highest in our tradition and the outstanding home of our moral and cultural values.” In the effective liberal arts college young men and young women may become:

Lords of an Empire, wide as Shakespeare's soul,
Sublime as Milton's immemorial theme,
Rich as Chaucer's speech and fair as Spenser's dream.

As liberal education is vital to the greatest freedom in the life of an individual human being, so is it vital to the life of a free society. Good tires and high speed do not lessen the need for good driving. To overcome the confusion, inhumanity and de-

struction of our day we must rely on clear thinking, humane feeling and exercised good will. People, not dictators, must make the decisions of the future. Appreciation of great values and of eternal principles must therefore be developed in some measure in countless minds if these decisions are to be wise and just.

The education that addresses itself to the whole personality will best prepare citizens for this responsibility. Many of the major functions of life are shared by all members of the community. One does not escape the duty of being an intelligent voter by becoming a skilled engineer. Helplessness and lack of imagination before a community problem can not be excused because one is the trained pilot of an airplane.

It is not enough however to be aware of one's responsibility to the community. Loyal Nazi and Communist youths have accepted this responsibility with enthusiasm. If men are to be free, they must have a capacity for critical and independent thought or their loyalty to the state will make them ready pawns of the demagogue. The very effectiveness of modern communication entails a danger that uncritical minds may be responsive to mass appeals and emotional contagion.

The capacity for independent thought is the distinguishing mark of a liberally educated person. Democracy itself can succeed only where its citizens assert the right and assume the responsibility of thinking for themselves rather than accepting their thought from set molds. Sir Richard Livingstone has called attention to the frequency with which citizens of unquestioned reliability in personal matters are willing to distort facts in political arguments. Our democratic society needs the leavening influence of men and women who weigh the facts and make discriminating judgments, who know when a thing has been proved and when it has not been proved, who do not blindly and eagerly assume that one's own political party is always and on all issues altogether right and the opposing party always and on all issues altogether wrong.

The values of a liberal education for the individual and for the free community will not be realized fully if those of us who believe in this kind of education are afraid of change. Faith in liberal education is not an easy exercise of respect for tradition.

The vital part of the tradition of liberal education is that it should not be static and unchanging, but vital and living and free. Its adherents will not insist that all students of the liberal arts take four years of Greek. We shall not insist that liberal arts education must be defined in terms of the curriculum of 1900 or that of 1950. Many changes in the content of this curriculum have taken place and many may be expected in the future. Nor shall we insist that it be carried on over a four-year period, nor that it be reserved for a few, in line with an aristocratic concept of education happily rejected in America. More significantly, we shall not maintain that it be divorced from all vocational education, for we shall point out its relationship to definite tasks in our society; in some areas, as in the education of teachers, we shall seek effective partnership with vocational education in a single institution.

It must be added that if liberal education is to free the individual and contribute to the health of a free society, it must be carried on in an atmosphere of freedom. This means that faculties must know freedom from financial insecurity as well as freedom of thought within the commitment of the institution they serve. Compensation appropriate to the value of the teaching function will be given, not for the sake of the comfort of teachers, but for the sake of our own self-respect as American citizens.

We have all been deeply moved by the grants of the Ford Foundation. This support comes not from sentimental attachment to a particular institution but out of the deliberate decision that this kind of education should be undergirded across the nation. This support is given at what is probably the point of greatest need and certainly at the point where the quality of education is determined. This magnificent gift to education should challenge the constituency of each of our colleges to greater faith in its future and to greater generosity in its support.

A second freedom which must be cherished of course is that of freedom of thought for the teacher. While the battle for such freedom seems presently to be won, it is not inopportune to remember that this freedom must be jealously guarded—not surrendered to orthodoxy nor cast aside before any fear. The teacher who is afraid to express a well-considered opinion con-

cerning a social problem because of any social pressure is disloyal to his profession and to his obligation as a citizen. The group which would impose upon teachers a particular viewpoint about matters of economic or political policy is disloyal to the nation and to its heritage.

We do right to protest every effort to limit our academic liberties. No one must tell us what we have to think or where we must come out. We must not let ourselves be frightened into silence. Restrictive laws will strangle education; the gray smog of fear will smother it to death. We must strike out against both: the atmosphere may be harder to grapple with than the antagonist but both must be resisted. Yet necessary as this resistance is, it is neither the best nor the most that we can do for freedom. Our great stroke will not be the one that sets us free from criticism but the one that reveals us as free for service. Our demonstrated responsibility is the positive offensive tactic which will be the surest defense of our freedom.

In defending our freedom, we shall welcome controversy and the right to contrary opinion. We shall seek to know and to grow in knowledge, but we shall also be proud to believe in something and to assert our faith.

As the oak tree, being alive, changes in aspect but remains an oak, so truth, living and not static, is forever new and yet essentially the same. Shall we not maintain in liberal education a steady poise in a reeling age? Shall we not combine in our liberal arts colleges an abiding faith in the ancient verities and a poignant awareness of new intellectual and spiritual heights to be gained?

MEETING OF PRESIDENTS' WIVES

ALICE DISTLER
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

THE annual meeting of presidents' wives was called to order at 9:30 A.M., Wednesday, 11 January 1956 by Mrs. Ethan A. H. Shepley, wife of the Chancellor of Washington University.

When the minutes of the previous meeting had been read and approved, Mrs. Shepley said a few words of welcome. At her invitation each of the approximately 70 ladies present then introduced herself.

Mrs. Miller Upton of Beloit College gave a brief account of the presidents' institute held at Harvard in June 1955. This provoked much interest and many of those present expressed the desire to have more talks and discussions of a similar nature pertinent to their common problems.

The speaker of the morning was Dr. Blanche H. Dow, President of Cottey College, Nevada, Missouri. Her talk on *Partners in Liberal Education* was both stimulating and inspiring.

Dr. Dow's thesis was that because women are endowed with special qualities of disposition, intuitive faculties, sensitivities and imaginative traits, they are particularly qualified either to help make their husbands successful or to weaken their effectiveness in furthering liberal education.

To clarify her point, the speaker described her favorite picture, an illuminated miniature in a 15th-century manuscript by Christine of Pisa, known as the first woman who "wrote for a living." The picture portrays three women typifying "Reason," "Right" and "Justice." These three Christine believed to represent the strength of women.

"Reason," holding a mirror, suggests how imperative it is for women to cultivate the power derived from trained and functioning minds and to use logical, objective thinking.

"Right," holding a scepter, suggests the need for intellectual honesty and integrity. Dr. Dow emphasized the idea that trained, educated men and women should have a high sense of what is right and should shun what is "less right."

"Justice," holding scales, suggests the necessity of dedicating ourselves to the needs and betterment of others.

Dr. Dow urged us to take time out to evaluate ourselves, to ponder the intangibles that determine the future and to pray for divine guidance in our everyday problems.

The generous applause was a clear indication of the appreciation felt by the audience for Dr. Dow's talk.

Before the meeting adjourned, Mrs. Shepley introduced Mrs. Harry F. Harrington, wife of the Chairman of the President's Council of Saint Louis University, who acted as joint hostess, and Mrs. Arthur G. Coons, who as wife of the president-elect will preside at the wives' meeting in 1957.

Immediately after the close of the meeting most of the ladies boarded a special bus and did some sightseeing on the way to the St. Louis Art Museum. There they had time for browsing before the serving of a delicious luncheon.

When we left the museum, our genial bus driver pointed out places of interest en route to the Shaw mansion and gardens. The mansion with its original Victorian furnishings was very interesting but the hothouses in the garden proved an even greater attraction. There we saw plants and flowers from all parts of the world. The orchid display seemed to fascinate everybody, but little did we think that each of us would be the recipient of one of these exotic beauties when we arrived for tea at the lovely home of the Shepleys.

The tea party, glamorously bedecked with orchids, was the highlight of our visit to St. Louis.

Our sincere thanks go to St. Louis and Washington Universities and especially to Mrs. Shepley and Mrs. Harrington for providing such generous hospitality.

January 1957 seems far away, but we shall look forward with pleasant anticipation to getting together again in Philadelphia.

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE

LOUIS T. BENEZET
PRESIDENT, COLORADO COLLEGE

THE Commission, with five members present at its meeting, was stimulated this year by the visit of two distinguished representatives of the American Association of University Professors: Dr. Ralph F. Fuchs, successor to the late Ralph E. Himstead as General Secretary of the Association, and Professor Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago, long active on Committee A of the Association (whose field of responsibility corresponds with that of your Commission).

The purpose of this visit was to lay the groundwork for a joint project on procedures for hearings on tenure. From the 75 to 100 cases reported annually to AAUP it is evident that little if any clarity exists—and no standards—for the conduct of these regrettable but necessary hearings for a professor faced with dismissal. Your Commission and the secretariat of AAUP have no interest in dictating or even prescribing procedures. Our intent is, through joint sub-committee sessions to be held in the summer and fall of 1956, to submit before the next meeting of our respective plenary bodies a list of recommended steps in the conduct of hearings, by which individual persons and institutions may if they wish be guided. One central question, for instance, is the exact status of the administration in tenure hearings: is it prosecutor, judge or jury? Obviously it should not be all three: yet such has been the case on some campuses.

The Chairman has invited President Sarah G. Blanding of Vassar College and President Logan Wilson of the University of Texas to serve with him on the sub-committee.

Among other topics briefly touched upon was the potential value as a fringe benefit of sabbatical leaves. The Commission did not feel disposed at this stage, however, to recommend an immediate study of current practice.

In the general area of academic freedom, the Commission was once again aware that it could only give a passing polish to the surface of so vast a sphere. Apparently things are better for

us all, but no thanks are due to any systematic defense or counter-offensive on the part of the colleges. We are still pretty much at the mercy of the tides of opinion among our various publics and legislative groups. Attention may be called however to the Advisory Panel and Roster of Consultants recently appointed by our President to furnish help when a member college is faced with a crisis on teaching freedom, tenure or some similar problem.

In the coming tight market for faculty, recruitment practices and job-hopping will become increasingly matters for concern. We should not seek to curb faculty mobility or institutional initiative, but early annual shopping for teachers, resistance to late-summer raiding, and general inter-institutional courtesy, as well as faculty respect for a contract, should claim greater attention from us all.

It is 16 years since the basic principles of academic freedom and tenure were expressed in a statement prepared jointly by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors. The statement of 1940 made no provision for the specific issue of communism or for the invocation of the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Provisions for faculty appointment dates and acceptance dates were made under the good old leisurely conditions of faculty selection. We have no wish to plunge ourselves or anybody else into a heavy task, but your Commission believes it may be time to consider a thorough review of the position of the Association in the general areas of academic freedom versus responsibility and faculty-institutional relationships in matters of appointment and tenure. It seems probable that the dynamics of burgeoning enrolments will call for far-reaching re-alignments in the orientation of the teacher to his mounting responsibilities in higher education.

COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

DANIEL Z. GIBSON, ACTING CHAIRMAN

PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON COLLEGE

IN this, the beginning of our 20th year, it is a pleasure to submit an encouraging report for the past 12 months. Nineteen fifty-five began with a meeting of the Commission at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C. Attendance was the best on record, interest was keen and many helpful suggestions were offered. Chairman Ellis reported that the Board of Directors had voted the financial support necessary for the coming year from the general funds of the Association.

The fact that this decision was reached in January instead of March, as was the case in 1954, enabled us to circulate our list of visitors at a more advantageous period. Forty-six visitors were offered. The fields represented were as follows:

Music	10
Dance	4
Theatre	3
Fine Arts	10
Humanities	19

You will note a substantial increase in the number of visitors offered in the humanities and a decrease in the number of musicians. This action followed a recommendation of the Board of Directors which was approved by members of the Commission.

What has been the response to this new direction? Lecturers representing the humanities have not fared as well as visitors in other fields—music, drama, fine arts and dance. Interest in the dance during the current season has been particularly heartening. Inquiries from colleges all over the country lead us to the conclusion that this art form has now taken its rightful place among the contemporary arts.

This year, for the first time, we are offering a lecturer on motion pictures. Today there is considerable interest in films as a cultural and entertainment medium. We were fortunate in securing, for this field, Gordon Hendricks, writer, critic and radio commentator. He has completed a successful fall tour and is available during the spring semester. "One significant re-

sult of Mr. Hendricks' visit," reports a college, "has been the establishment of a new course in the General Education sequence called Theatre Arts Survey. This includes critical evaluation of films, television and stage plays. We shall be glad to have him return next year to see the results of what he was a factor in starting."

A recent self-study report by Colby College entitled *A Climate Favorable for Learning* concludes that "aesthetic appreciation, whether in fine arts, in music or literature, is a vital part of a climate favorable to learning."

For 19 years, the Arts Program, through its visitors, has helped create this climate on some 600 college campuses. Our major premise is aptly stated by the head of a music department: "Let me say that the entire faculty appreciates the splendid assistance of the Arts Program. Without the arts there can be no true culture, and the purpose of a liberal arts education is defeated unless an understanding of the fine arts is developed. By making such competent artists available to colleges at such low fees, you are helping to raise our standards of culture."

You will be pleased to know that an annual grant of \$5,000 toward the general support of the Arts Program has been made by the Culpeper Foundation, and that the Board of Directors has voted to continue an appropriation from the Association's general funds. With this assurance of support for our present operations, we can now think in terms of an expanding program and approach other foundations with confidence.

We ask your suggestions and help in preparing a larger and more comprehensive roster of visitors for the 1956-57 season.

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

HAROLD L. YOCHUM

PRESIDENT, CAPITAL UNIVERSITY

IN addition to the customary meeting at the close of the 1955 Annual Meeting of the Association, the Commission held two meetings during the year: at the Neil House, Columbus, Ohio on 16 May 1955 and at the Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri, in conjunction with the 1956 Annual Meeting, on 10 January 1956.

At the May meeting, Chairman Harold L. Yochum presided and Presidents Frank A. Rose, Celestin J. Steiner and W. J. Trent and Executive Director Distler were present. The Commission approved the change proposed by the Board of Directors in the planning of the opening session of the Annual Meeting. It was agreed that the Commission should reconsider its by-laws, particularly in relation to mandatory committees, with the aim of providing greater freedom in organizing committees. The Commission also agreed to make preliminary inquiries into a possible change in the date of Christian Higher Education Day.

At the January meeting, Chairman Yochum presided and the following members of the Commission were present: Hunter B. Blakely, I. Lynd Esch, James Franklin Findlay, Russell J. Humbert, Robert L. Montgomery, Stephen W. Paine, Frank A. Rose, Celestin J. Steiner, Frederick E. Welfle and Guy E. Snavely, Secretary-Treasurer.

A report was made on the research committee's appropriation for a book on "What is a Christian College?" to be written by a sub-committee under the chairmanship of Raymond F. McLain, now President of the American University at Cairo. Dr. McLain had written that the manuscript of the book was complete except the last chapter, which would be ready for publication by the end of January. It was later reported that the manuscript was being considered for publication in the immediate future by Harper and Brothers.

Secretary Snavely reported that his book "The Church and the Four Year College" had been published by Harper and Brothers and that a complimentary copy had been sent to the president of every member college in the Association. Many favorable comments had been made on the book. The committee voted to ex-

press their gratification to the author for the service rendered by the publication of this timely book.

Chairman Yochum gave a report on the last meeting of the Midwestern Regional Conference, held this year for the first time in conjunction with the annual meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, in Chicago on 22 March 1955. Approval was given to the continuance of this arrangement in place of a separate meeting of the type held for many years at Omaha, Nebraska. President Celestin J. Steiner of the University of Detroit is chairman of the Midwestern Regional Conference for 1956. He announced that he would obtain a room at the Palmer House at the time of the North Central meeting and that an inspirational program was being arranged.

Secretary Snavely reported that a well-attended meeting of the Southern Regional Conference had been held in Miami, Florida on 29 November 1955 in conjunction with the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The officers of the Association were requested to inquire into the feasibility of arranging conferences of church-related colleges in conjunction with the annual meetings of other regional associations, particularly the Middle States, the Northwest and the Western.

After informal discussion it was the consensus that the present plan of having articles of particular interest to church-related colleges interspersed with other articles in the *BULLETIN* is preferable to the previous arrangement whereby a separate section was devoted to them.

After discussion of a possible change of date for Christian Education Day of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. it was agreed that no action be taken.

The following five presidents were chosen as members of the Commission for the term ending in 1959:

Carlyle Campbell, Meredith College, Raleigh, North Carolina
Peyton N. Rhodes, Southwestern at Memphis, Tennessee

C. Hoyt Watson, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Washington

Frederick E. Welfle, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio

J. Wilhelm Ylvisaker, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

According to custom it was agreed that the retiring commissioners, as well as the new members, be invited to meet with the

other members of the Commission at breakfast at 7:30 A.M. on Thursday the 12th. * * *

The breakfast meeting was attended by Presidents Esch, Humbert, Montgomery, Paine, Steiner and Ylvisaker, and Secretary Blakely. In the unavoidable absence of Chairman Yochum and Secretary-Treasurer Snavely, Dr. Blakely presided and Mr. F. L. Wormald acted as secretary.

The following officers of the Commission for 1956 were unanimously elected:

President I. Lynd Esch, *Chairman*

President Celestin J. Steiner, *Vice Chairman*

Chancellor Guy E. Snavely, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

President Esch then took the chair.

It was agreed that committees on research, publications, conferences and nominations should be appointed by the Chairman in consultation with the Secretary-Treasurer and the Executive Director of the Association.

The Commission agreed that its function was to represent the common interest of the church-related colleges, Catholic and Protestant, and that with the aid of the increased funds appropriated by the Association it should seek to conduct a concrete program of action.

The Secretary-Treasurer was requested to circulate to all members of the Commission a list of members for 1956, together with a copy of the Constitution of the Commission and of any other important documents relating to its work.

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Commission should be held in the offices of the Association of American Colleges in Washington, D. C. on or about 14 May 1956.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND INDUSTRY

FRANK H. SPARKS

PRESIDENT, WABASH COLLEGE

CONSISTENT with the will of the members of the Commission, expressed at the Annual Meeting of the Association in Washington last January, the clearing house activities of the Commission on Colleges and Industry have been carried on with increased vigor.

A budget of \$45,000 was approved by the Action Committee, \$40,000 of which has been underwritten and \$5,000 of which is in prospect.

The Clearing House has continued with its informational services, consisting of quarterly bulletins and heavy daily correspondence and telephone conversations.

Consulting services are available and are being moderately used.

Interstate solicitation of national corporations has been greatly expanded. One hundred sixteen corporations with headquarters in Akron, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis or Wilmington were called upon during the week beginning 24 October by teams of three college presidents. Additional interviews are contemplated during the spring months.

Another two-day workshop was held in Indianapolis during August. Again through the generosity of Lilly Endowment, Inc. transportation costs were equalized for distant delegates and hotel expenses were paid for all conferees. Thirty-two of the 34 state and regional associations were represented by one or more participants.

This conference voted decisively to make a test of a national depository. Consent was obtained from the directors of the Association for the Commission on Colleges and Industry to serve as the receiving and disbursing agent and plans were completed for testing the central fund idea during the October solicitation.

Up to the present, six corporations have elected to use this agency and have made gifts totaling \$145,200, most of which is to be divided among the state and regional associations on the basis of institutional membership.

The Commission was in session for the full day on 10 January 1956; attendance was good and the reports excellent.

Thirty-four state and regional associations covering 38 states, with a membership of 411 colleges, reported gifts from 3,570 corporations aggregating \$4,267,735 for the calendar year 1955.

This compares with 32 associations covering 36 states, with a membership of 400 colleges, receiving 1,937 gifts totaling \$2,772,515 for 1954.

This increase in number of gifts and in dollars reflects millions of footsteps and thousands of conversations by hundreds of earnest, hard-working, strong-hearted college presidents.

Financial support does not always come in response to a reasoned, intelligent request but almost never does it come without such a request. It is safe to say that for each of the 3,570 successful missions reported, at least four additional tries have not yet paid off.

The Commission in official session, with representatives from 32 of the 34 associations present, voted unanimously to approve the following structural and procedural changes (previously approved by the Board of Directors of the Association):

"The Action Committee of the Commission on Colleges and Industry shall consist of a chairman and a secretary, to serve until replaced; five college president members of the Association, to serve on a rotating basis, one member being replaced each year; and five associate members, executive directors of state or regional associations, who shall serve on a rotating basis.

The unexpired terms of the present members of the Action Committee shall be as follows:

Very Reverend W. Patrick Donnelly, Loyola University—
one year

Dr. James P. Baxter, III, Williams College—two years

Dr. W. Terry Wickham, Heidelberg College—three years.

The unexpired terms of the present associate members of the Action Committee shall be as follows:

B. J. Kemper, Minnesota—one year

Harold K. Schellinger, Ohio—two years

A. Merrill Allyn, Pennsylvania—three years

Frank A. Tredinnick, New England—four years.

No member who has served for more than a year on the Action

Committee shall be eligible for re-election until after the lapse of one year from the expiry of his most recent term of service.

Frank H. Sparks shall be the chairman and H. E. Hastings, Jr. the secretary of the Action Committee.

Laurence M. Gould's resignation from the Action Committee is accepted with regret.

Frank A. Rose shall be elected to a five-year term, and Carter Davidson to a four-year term, as college president members, and A. Lea Booth shall be elected to a five-year term as an associate member.

The chairman and secretary of the Action Committee shall be empowered to receive and disburse funds, and to receive and sell stocks, bonds and other securities.

The national depository shall be known henceforth as the American College Fund, and the following options for giving shall replace those now in effect:

1. The donor may designate the distribution of his gift in any way he desires;
2. Money may be designated to go only to liberal arts colleges which are non-tax-supported, and are members of the Association of American Colleges;
3. All undesignated gifts shall be divided among the state and regional associations in proportion to the number of member colleges in each, to be distributed by them according to their formulae."

This movement is still very young but it is no longer tentative. It has every evidence of permanency. Its direct monetary benefits are already meaningful in the budgets of many colleges. Its indirect benefits are manifold. Together they augur well for the future.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES

MARK H. INGRAHAM

DEAN, COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

THE retirement policy of a college and the various "fringe" benefits it is able to provide for its faculty, including several types of insurance, are means of increasing the educational effectiveness of the institution, by helping to secure for the college and for the profession the best possible staff and by keeping the morale of that staff high through maximizing psychic compensation and minimizing fear and resentment. The problem of adapting these means to fulfill this purpose effectively though presenting certain perennial aspects, is nevertheless constantly changing. Supply and demand for teachers, death rates, health conditions, social standards, the competitive position of an institution and of the profession, all affect the determination of policy and are always varying.

Some of the basic questions deal with:

- (1) Normal retirement age
- (2) Use of staff after normal retirement age
- (3) Normal retirement income and the means of providing it
- (4) Group life insurance
- (5) Group medical insurance
- (6) Group disability insurance.

These topics are intertwined but in a report, since logic is linear, must be treated *seriatim*. Hence, after a few general remarks as to the setting in which these topics are approached, they will be discussed under the above headings.

After a scholar finishes his graduate work and during the early years of marriage and raising a family, some of the problems that loom large are:

- (a) Paying his current bills
- (b) Securing a position with tenure
- (c) Providing for the security of his family in case of death or disability.

During his forties and fifties a faculty member's position is generally secure; in spite of the cost of a college education for his children, he can usually meet current expenses unless there is a serious emergency or a debt already incurred to be paid. However, the problem of family security in case of death or disability is of major importance and awareness of the problems of old age is increasing.

From the late fifties until retirement, if one's health is good, the meeting of current expenses is less difficult and some savings may be effected. The problem of family security in case of death or disability begins to merge with that of old age, which becomes perhaps the greatest financial problem of the individual.

The problems listed above are personal. To what degree should they concern an institution? The institution's concern arises in several ways. If the neglect or lack of success of the individual in providing for his own or his family's welfare results in decrease in the morale of the staff, or pressures to make unwise decisions on the part of the institution, or adverse opinions on the part of the public, the college itself is directly affected. If, by providing certain fringe benefits, the morale of the staff, and the competitive position of the institution can be enhanced more than by using for salaries the money required for these benefits, then it would be wise to provide them. Sometimes different funds can be tapped to provide fringe benefits than to provide salaries. Moreover, certain fringe benefits can be secured more cheaply by an institution for its members than by the members individually.

In discussing the topics below one should constantly bear in mind that:

- (a) The population is increasingly "security conscious"
- (b) We have recently passed through an inflation which may be continuing
- (c) Longevity is increasing
- (d) Health at all ages is improving
- (e) The teaching load of American higher education is increasing and will do so very rapidly in the 1960's. This may result in a serious shortage of qualified teachers.

(It must be admitted that item (d) rests more on impressions and on conversations with doctors than on any statistical data we have at the moment.)

(1) *Normal retirement age.* Few institutions have a normal retirement age below 65 or above 70. Some institutions have a single fixed retirement age; others have a period in which continuation of employment is provided for with some such statement as "retirement is normally at 65 but annual appointments until 68 may be made by the institution." Many institutions occasionally continue appointments even beyond what is said to be the final retirement age.

In selecting a retirement age on the assumption that it will be observed for the large majority of the faculty, one balances such considerations favoring an early retirement age (say 65) as:

- (a) The number of persons who have decreased vitality in the later years
- (b) The occasional "mistake" which one does not wish to prolong too far
- (c) The concern for giving the younger men opportunities both financially and in the way of responsibility;

with, on the other side, such considerations as:

- (a) The number of extremely useful persons who may be cut off by early retirement from making as great a contribution as they might to society and to the institution
- (b) The additional cost of securing a satisfactory retirement allowance at an earlier age
- (c) For the next decade or so, the decrease in the supply of teachers at a time when the profession as a whole will be understaffed.

For those institutions which, as described above, use a period of time that is optional on the part of the institutions, it is the belief of the committee that the pressures of teacher demand will tend to make the latest age of such a period the most frequently used.

Our committee suggests that those institutions whose normal retirement age is below 68 to 70 should consider carefully the possibility of raising that age.

(2) *Use of Staff after normal retirement age.* The question of how, upon occasion, to employ a staff member even after the fixed retirement age is a pressing one. If no such exceptions are made much useful personnel will not be used unless the retirement age is quite late.

The committee suggests consideration of the following possibilities:

- (a) Greater use of retired personnel from one institution by another institution. This avoids invidious selection on the part of the administration. It is particularly useful in cases where the new employing institution has a retirement age higher than the former employing institution and hence no problem of morale is created, unless the "retired" person is brought in at too high a level. Pressing shortages may be met or temporary vacancies filled by such means. Encouraged and supported by the Whitney Foundation, this process has

already started. It will not have large use however unless regular institutional funds are used for the purpose. The problem of information concerning available people arises in this connection and a national roster of retired and retiring staff members would be of great use. The members of the Association should cooperate with any responsible organization which establishes such a roster.

- (b) Some of the problems of continued employment in the same institution beyond a fixed retirement age can be alleviated by making exceptions:
 - (i) For part time only
 - (ii) On a special basis so that no administrative responsibility or authority is involved.
 - (iii) For men of clearly unusual ability and continued vitality.
- (c) A sliding scale of retirement has often been suggested in which both duties and salaries decrease after a given age, perhaps starting before what has normally been a fixed retirement age and continuing after that age.

(3) *Normal retirement income and the means of providing it.*

A joint committee of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges conducted a study of retirement planning which was reported in 1950. Its report, with amendments made in 1953 stated that a faculty retirement system should "be planned to provide under normal circumstances and insofar as possible for a retirement life annuity equivalent in purchasing power to approximately 50% of the average salary over the last 10 years of service, if retirement is at 70, and a somewhat higher percentage if the fixed retirement age is younger."

The logic of this recommendation takes a little consideration in order to be apparent, since it is obviously easier to provide a good retirement allowance at 70 than at, say, 65. An individual however who is employed during the period from 65 to 70 may well make savings in addition to the amount that goes toward his retirement annuity, so that he can supplement the retirement annuity at 70 more effectively than he could if his retirement were earlier.

An institution which makes use of OASI plus an annuity based upon TIAA and CREF, using a combined contribution of 10% or more of salary, may reasonably expect to meet this minimum requirement. Most of the strong private institutions have

such a system. Of the state universities, 25 have come under OASI and it would seem that 22 of these added it to their previous retirement systems. While many of these dual systems are now excellent, it should be pointed out that in some cases the previous retirement system was totally inadequate and in a few cases it remains inadequate even with the addition of OASI. The majority of the other state universities are studying the question. We do not have as adequate a report on other public institutions, but it may be assumed that conditions are less favorable than in the state universities.

In order that a retirement system may contribute satisfactorily to the protection of an individual's old age, it is necessary that, in conformity with two other principles stated in the 1950 report, it should:

- "(d) Ensure that the full amount of the individual's and institution's contribution, with the accumulations thereon, be vested in the individual, available as a benefit in case of death while in service, and with no forfeiture in case of withdrawal or dismissal from the institution
- "(e) Be such that the individual may not withdraw his equity in cash but only in the form of an annuity. . . ."

Many public retirement systems fail to meet these requirements and should be revised.

A major effort is still needed by most public institutions as well as by many private institutions in order to make their retirement systems adequate. The possibility of coverage under OASI gives an opportunity to do so, but the mere addition of such coverage will in these cases rarely produce a satisfactory system.

(4) *Group life insurance.* Most retirement plans now in effect are such that there is a death benefit which increases with length of service for those members who die before retirement. This should be taken into account in connection with any group life insurance plan which, important as it is to all age groups, is particularly important to those entering the profession and to those who have not been in it long. It is also important to the institution, both from the point of view of morale and from the point of view of eliminating pressure to employ members of the family of the deceased. In planning group insurance, care should be taken to make sure that the cost to the younger mem-

bers of the group is not too greatly out of line with the expenses of these same members. Some institutions have arranged insurance plans under which the individual and the institution contribute but the cost of the term insurance, which is inexpensive for the younger members, is more than met by their contributions alone. We question the equity of such a plan.

The committee believes that most colleges should concentrate their life insurance coverage at the younger ages, where salary is small, family responsibility large and the cost of protection modest. The death benefit of the retirement plan will usually provide much of the needed protection at the higher ages.

(5) *Group medical insurance.* It is the judgment of the committee that the recent development of "Major Medical" or catastrophic medical insurance is of considerably more importance than the more limited medical insurance previously on the market. Smaller medical expenses, though embarrassing, can be met by an individual as are other unexpected expenses not of a major order. However, expensive surgery or prolonged medical expense of the catastrophic type cannot be met by the average college staff member otherwise than through the Major Medical form of coverage.

(6) *Group disability insurance.* Of a nature similar to catastrophic medical insurance, group insurance for major, long-time disability should be pushed vigorously. To the institution this is of even greater importance than the catastrophic medical coverage, since there is always the temptation—often a moral obligation—to keep an individual on the payroll for a prolonged period even though his services may be non-existent or nominal, thereby precluding new appointments and injuring the educational program of the institution. If we had adequate disability insurance such pressures would not be present beyond a reasonable period of sick leave.

Disability insurance currently on the market is designed only for short-time protection. There is a very real need for coverage to assure each staff member that if he becomes disabled, so that he cannot perform his normal duties for a prolonged period, he will receive an income. This type of insurance is not yet available, dovetailing as it should with the salary and retirement programs of the institution. We urge that the Association use its offices to further plans for the initiation of such a program.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION THROUGH EDUCATION

FRANCIS S. HUTCHINS
PRESIDENT, BEREA COLLEGE

THE Commission has had one formal meeting, which was attended by representatives of the Department of State, the U. S. Information Agency, the Institute of International Education, the American Universities Field Staff and the National Student Association.

Attention centered on the importance of international cultural exchanges at all levels for the furtherance of understanding between peoples. The importance of fuller participation by all member colleges in programs designed to increase international understanding was stressed.

In order that more member colleges may share in these opportunities, the Commission enthusiastically approved of the publication by the Institute of International Education of a brochure: "The Liberal Arts College in the United States—A Guide for Students from Foreign Lands." The Commission would recommend that the Association cooperate in this undertaking. We would express appreciation to the Hazen Foundation of the grant which makes this project possible.

The Commission recorded its approval of the various programs of the U. S. Government facilitating cultural exchanges as being imperative for better understanding between peoples.

The Commission heard with great interest of the many opportunities which exist for direct helpful contacts between individual American institutions and foreign institutions. It was suggested that groups of colleges located conveniently in a given area might be formed to cooperate in these programs.

The Commission recommends that a communication go to member institutions pointing out the importance of this institution-to-institution cooperation. The Commission urges member colleges indicate to the Commission their interest individually or as groups in such international contacts.

Furthermore the Commission would express the hope that the Association will emphasize in its next annual meeting international cooperation through education, inviting to its platform and its annual meeting representative foreign educators.

COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION

RICHARD D. WEIGLE

PRESIDENT, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE (MARYLAND)

OVER the past year the Commission has addressed itself to the discovery and development of practical proposals to revitalize the teaching of the liberal arts as the wellspring of learning in our colleges and universities. The members of the Commission are concerned that the coming pressure of numbers shall bring neither accommodation to vocationalism nor the diminution of quality in the liberal education of the next decades. Their preoccupation has therefore been with ways and means to renew and restore the liberal arts within individual institutions. They are convinced that good teachers beget good teachers and that the best assurance of vital faculties for tomorrow lies in the stimulus which the liberal arts teaching of today is imparting to young minds and hearts.

The Commission therefore forsook the perennially challenging task of defining liberal education and sought instead recommendations for positive programs of action to lay before the Association. In a sense it seeks definition through doing. Its method of procedure was to divide itself into three sub-committees: (1) a committee to explore collaboration with secondary schools and graduate schools, (2) a committee to plan assistance to colleges in strengthening their liberal arts program and (3) a committee to investigate the use of state or regional education associations to further the liberal arts. The proposals which follow are a modest beginning to a never-ending task.

As a first principle the Commission holds that the college president himself must be a liberal educator. He must bear the personal responsibility for leadership in promoting the liberal arts in his own institution. This function may not be delegated to a dean, valuable as his assistance may be. The Commission believes that the president himself must seek constantly and consciously to scrutinize and question, to appraise and interpret the function and significance of the liberal arts in terms which will be meaningful to students and faculty, to the governing board and to the general public.

In acknowledging this fundamental responsibility, the members of the Commission were acutely and unanimously aware of a serious exhaustion of their own mental resources. Constant speaking without correlative reading and study has depleted

intellectual capital. Words and concepts have become stereotyped and lost their vitality. Gone too, is competence in the philosophy and psychology necessary to analysis of educational problems. As one weary administrator phrased it, cross-fertilization has become cross-sterilization. This means then that the individual members of the Commission sense their need as presidents for a regeneration of spirit, a building of new understandings and a replenishment of intellectual reservoirs. Otherwise they can hardly continue to exert the imaginative and provocative leadership which should characterize the liberal arts college.

If this feeling is shared by other members of the Association, the Commission recommends that the problem be made a matter of urgent consideration by individuals or by small groups of presidents. As for the Commission, it has committed itself to a rigorous experimental period of reading, study and discussion of the philosophic and psychological bases of liberal arts education. It suggests for this purpose a full week during the early summer in some relatively inaccessible place. It proposes to enlist some of the most challenging minds available to guide and moderate its study and discussions. It hopes for new understandings and new resources from such a community of learning. It believes that from such an experience it can evolve re-creative programs helpful alike to college presidents, faculties and students in redefining and revivifying the liberal arts within the individual institution.

At the same time the Commission urges upon each member college or university the desirability of undertaking an internal study of its aims and objectives and of the degree of effectiveness with which its educational program approximates the ends in view. Such studies are believed to be especially beneficial when shared in by both faculty and students, functioning both independently and jointly at different stages. In this connection the Commission proposes to circulate to member colleges and universities copies of completed and published self-studies insofar as they are available.

The Commission likewise believes that a useful purpose would be served by compiling data about interesting educational programs in various colleges and by making such information available through the Association as a clearing house. Administrators and faculty members would thus be able to obtain full and au-

thoritative facts on aims, content, organization, staff and budget of such programs as great issues courses, honors programs, directed studies programs and the like. The Commission recommends this to the Association as a specific project for the coming year.

The Commission devoted considerable time to discussion of the relationships between the liberal arts college and the secondary school, on the one hand, and the liberal arts college and the graduate or professional school on the other. At both levels it was judged of the utmost importance to seek clarification of common purposes and mutual appreciation of common problems.

In the case of graduate study, the Commission recognizes the prior responsibility of the Commission on Preprofessional Education and therefore offers its endorsement and support for any concrete plan designed to reduce preprofessional encroachment upon the liberal arts curriculum and to assure a smooth and logical transition from the liberal education of the college to necessarily specialized training at the graduate level. The Commission believes that there might well be flexible rather than fixed criteria for such transition and it would welcome an opportunity to cooperate with any group investigating the problem.

Of direct and immediate concern to the Commission is the relationship at the other end of the college course, namely with the secondary school. Here the first consideration must be emphasis upon maintaining the quality of education at both secondary and college levels. By further efforts along the line so promisingly begun by the School and College Study of Admission with Advanced Standing and now being developed under the leadership of the Advanced Standing Program of the College Entrance Examination Board, it should be possible for schoolmen and college faculties to arrive at greater continuity of purpose, to attain enrichment of curriculum at both levels and to effect a better transition for students of varying intellectual capacity.

This suggests the second consideration, namely that the steady growth of the student be assured at his own optimum rate of development. Recent experiments in early admission and in admission with advanced standing by certain colleges and secondary schools seem to challenge the assumption of a minimum chronological age or a fixed number of years of formal schooling as a condition of college entrance. If this is true, perhaps the ex-

periments indicate the need for a more flexible examination system for college entrance and a movement away from the concept of time-units. On the other hand, such a step poses in turn questions as to the type of examination to be employed, the problem of general maturity in the accelerated student, and the loss to his fellows involved in drawing off the abler student from the third or fourth year of secondary work.

To investigate further the problems and complexities of such relationships, the Commission recommends the establishment of an exploratory committee to include five secondary school administrators, five college presidents, five graduate school deans, and representation from the College Entrance Examination Board. Its terms of reference would be to consider: first, the quality of liberal education and the possible enrichment of curricula in both the secondary school and the college; second, the desirability of more flexible standards in the transition of students from one level to the other. It would be within the province of the committee to formulate an agenda which in turn might become the basis for discussion by regional and other groups representing the three interested elements of the educational system and which might subsequently lead to a program of action.

Finally, in this very connection, the Commission noted with warm approbation the efforts of regional and local educational associations, of learned societies and of other groups to make more explicit and meaningful liberal education in its manifold aspects. The Commission offers its cooperation and assistance to such groups in the planning and carrying out of future conferences and programs. As a concrete step toward this end, the Commission proposes to invite a few selected representatives from the learned societies to meet with it on occasion during the coming year, and in due course to extend a similar invitation to leaders of regional associations. The Commission learned also of a project undertaken by one of the major industrial corporations of the nation to discover the validity of the liberal arts education of its management personnel. Believing that fruitful data may emerge from a study of this type, the Commission has agreed to accept the corporation's invitation to examine and discuss the preliminary findings. In general, it welcomes every opportunity to cooperate with groups sharing its concern for the reinterpretation and revitalization of liberal arts education.

COMMISSION ON PREPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

O. P. KRETZMANN

PRESIDENT, VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY

DURING the past year the work of your Commission has been confined largely to the compilation and evaluation of relevant materials which have appeared in various publications. A small grant from the Hardt Foundation enabled the Commission to prepare detailed summaries of the present situation in the field of preprofessional training, especially in medicine and law, for all members of the Commission.

We are happy to report that the areas of agreement between the undergraduate liberal arts colleges and the professional schools, to which we referred last year, are still increasing. All leaders of both groups agree that the best possible preparation for professional study is a broad, thorough training in the liberal arts. The social implications of this trend are far-reaching and significant. It is now evident that in the years to come we shall have a growing number of men and women in the professions who are not only good practitioners but also good citizens with a thorough knowledge of the ideas and values which have been decisive in the progress of Western civilization.

We should like again to call attention to a volume which has already exerted a wide and beneficent influence on all preprofessional education: "Preparation for Medical Education in the Liberal Arts College" by Aura E. Severinghaus, Harry J. Carman, and William E. Cadbury, Jr. This volume is not only an excellent summary of the present situation in premedical education but also a sane and philosophically sound statement of the perennially valid principles which must undergird all liberal education.

In the field of prelegal education the 1950 report of Judge Arthur Vanderbilt and the statement by John G. Hervey "Preparation for the Legal Profession" in the *Rocky Mountain Law Review* are still basic. Both essays emphasize certain fundamental requirements which will be referred to later in this report.

Undoubtedly the most important development in the work of your Commission during the past year has been the carrying out of a resolution adopted by the Association last year. With

the encouragement of our Executive Director, Dr. Distler, and the aid of the grant to the Association from the Lilly Endowment, your Commission was able to conduct a conference on Tuesday, 10 January 1956 with representatives of various groups and associations that are vitally interested in the problems of preprofessional education. In addition to the members of your Commission the following men were present:

- Dean Aura E. Severinghaus, representing the Association of American Medical Colleges;
- Mr. John G. Hervey, Director of the Committee on Legal Education of the American Bar Association;
- Dr. G. V. Lannholm, representing the Educational Testing Service;
- Dean Frederic W. Ness of Dickinson College;
- Dean William L. Dunn of Lake Forest College, representing the American Conference of Academic Deans.

Under the leadership of these distinguished representatives your Commission conducted a thorough and very profitable discussion of the basic problems in preprofessional education.

Some of the factors which were emphasized, particularly by Dean Severinghaus and Mr. Hervey, were the following:

1. A greater emphasis on liberal education is necessary.
2. Students must be able to make value judgments.
3. There have been marked changes in the admission policies of most medical schools during the past few years—always in the direction of the liberal arts.
4. Four years of liberal arts training are now required in more than half of our medical schools.
5. The future of medical practice probably lies in the area of group practice.
6. Both Dean Severinghaus and Mr. Hervey emphasized the need of thoroughly competent and carefully chosen premedical and prelegal advisers in the liberal arts colleges. The importance of these positions was repeatedly mentioned. It was also urged that the liberal arts colleges set up a budget for traveling expenses of these advisers to the professional schools for consultation.
7. Mr. John G. Hervey, the representative of the American Bar Association, indicated that more required courses should be included in the curriculum for prelegal students.
8. Both representatives joined in an emphasis on additional work in language and communication. They also agreed

that the concept of "service" in both professions should receive greater attention in the educational process.

9. The conference also agreed to recommend that representatives of the professional associations be invited regularly to the state meetings of colleges and universities. It was felt that this would be one of the most important and valuable factors in the establishment and maintenance of complete and sympathetic understanding between the liberal arts colleges and the professional schools.
10. It was suggested that the Association of American Colleges recommend to the American Bar Association that regular reports on the status of liberal arts graduates in law schools be sent to the respective colleges. The Association of American Medical Schools has been doing this for some time. It has been an exceedingly important factor in the evaluation of the work of the college on the undergraduate level.

Another valuable part of the conference was the report of Dean Ness of Dickinson College concerning plans for a "Guide to Graduate Study." It was agreed that sufficient information on the professional schools was available to our liberal arts colleges but that general information concerning graduate work in the arts and sciences was not available in a single volume. Dean Ness presented a review of the present situation and an outline of the proposed "Guide." The members of the Commission agreed that such a volume would be particularly timely in view of the great need for college teachers during the next decade. After thorough discussion of the entire proposal it was agreed to recommend to the Board of Directors the publication of the "Guide to Graduate Study" at the earliest possible moment. While the preparation of this volume would be under the direction of a special editorial committee, it is hoped that your Commission, representing the needs of our liberal arts colleges, will be able to offer counsel in the preparation of the volume.

Our specific recommendations to the Association are as follows:

1. We recommend that the name of our Commission be changed to "Commission on Preparation for Professional and Graduate Study." This recommendation is of course subject to the approval of the Board of Directors, particularly in its implications for the work of other commissions.

2. Your Commission recommends that under the guidance of our Executive Director funds be made available for annual conferences with representatives of the professional associations.
3. Your Commission recommends that the Association approve of the publication of the proposed "Guide to Graduate Study" and that the working out of this project be referred to the Board of Directors.

In conclusion, the Commission wishes to express its warm gratitude to Dr. Theodore A. Distler for his sympathetic and helpful leadership. We also wish to express our pleasure at the opening of additional channels of communication between the liberal arts colleges, the professional schools and the professional associations. It is our hope that this continuing interchange of ideas will lead to an ever-growing effectiveness in our common work. Our joint and insistent emphasis on both conscience and competence will certainly be most significant for the professions that are most immediately and decisively important for the welfare of our nation.

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

Interim Report to the Board of Directors

LOUIS J. LONG

PRESIDENT, WELLS COLLEGE

THE Commission on Public Relations met at 9:00 A.M., 10 January 1956 at the Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri. There were present: Brother Ambrose, Ralph L. Woodward, Norman P. Auburn and L. J. Long, Chairman.

There was a brief discussion of the future status of the Commission and its relation to the American College Public Relations Association. It was the consensus of the group that all action be deferred until a joint meeting of the Commission and a committee of three from ACPRA could be held. The tentative date for such a meeting is the third week in March. At this time the Commission plans to adopt either a program of action or a resolution to the Board of Directors that the Commission be disbanded.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

MAURICE O. ROSS, ACTING CHAIRMAN
PRESIDENT, BUTLER UNIVERSITY

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION AS AMENDED AND ADOPTED BY THE
ASSOCIATION IN GENERAL SESSION, THURSDAY, 12 JANUARY 1956

1. A report of progress and development on the study of baccalaureate origins of college teachers was made by Dean Frank R. Kille, Carleton College.

2. A report of progress on a College Teacher Recruitment Program was made by Dr. Theodore A. Distler, Executive Director of the Association.

3. A letter from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education to the Association of American Colleges containing an invitation to become a constituent member of the Council was received and considered.

With reference to the letter of invitation the Commission recommends that it is inadvisable for the Association of American Colleges to abandon its historic position by becoming an organic participant in an accrediting process, and therefore that the Association regretfully decline the invitation to accept constituent membership in the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

4. The Commission on Teacher Education also recommends that the Association of American Colleges endorse the resolution of the National Committee of Regional Accrediting Agencies of 10 January 1956, and instruct its representatives on the National Commission on Accrediting to act in accordance with the principles therein set forth. The resolution of the NCRAA on the accreditation of teacher education follows:

1. Whereas the regional associations are already involved in the evaluation and accreditation of teacher education at the undergraduate level, and most of them at the graduate level; and

2. Whereas the structure of NCATE is unacceptable, either at present or as proposed, because it is not institutionally controlled;

3. Therefore the National Committee of Regional Accrediting Agencies recommends that the regional associations reaffirm their

interest in the professional accrediting of teacher education, give particular attention to it in their evaluations, and specifically announce that their published regional lists include the professional accreditation of teacher education for institutions which offer professional programs in the field.

4. We further recommend that in such evaluations the regional associations seek the counsel of the relevant professional agencies and state education departments.

5. The NCRAA advances this proposal in the belief that such action will relieve the colleges and universities from the necessity of seeking additional accreditation from a specialized agency in teacher education.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THE past year has been a period of vigorous growth in both old and new fields of Association activity.

Believing that the achievements of a voluntary organization are proportionate to the interest shown by its membership, your directors have made it their central aim to encourage the members of the Association to take an increasingly active part in its day-to-day work.

The Board intends that the standing commissions and committees of the Association shall meet more often and shall be responsible for developing, where appropriate, concrete programs of action or study on the lines of those undertaken by the Commissions on the Arts, on Colleges and Industry and on Teacher Education. In 1955 the activities of other commissions were restricted by lack of funds to pay the cost of meetings, but a grant of \$50,000 made by Lilly Endowment, Inc. toward the operating expenses of the Association in 1956 and 1957 will be used mainly to remedy this state of affairs.

Following the precedent set a year ago, the chairmen of the several commissions and committees met with the Board on 9 January 1956, as a problems and policies committee, to consider our program for the coming year.

The Lilly grant, together with the projected increase of dues, will also enable the Executive Director and his staff to render greater service to member colleges by keeping in closer and more continuous contact with them.

The headquarters staff is now housed in a compact block of offices at the old address. Early in 1956 an additional room will be equipped as a combination of library and work room for visitors. Presidents and other representatives of member colleges are cordially invited to make it their headquarters when they have business in Washington. The American College Public Relations Association occupies adjacent offices, but the arrangement by which its rent is paid by the Association of American Colleges will come to an end on 31 August 1956.

It has been the policy of the Board to promote cooperation between the Association and other educational organizations in matters of common interest. Through our duly appointed rep-

representatives and through the office of the Executive Director, the Association has played an effective role in the deliberations of the American Council on Education and the National Commission on Accrediting and has kept in touch with the work of the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., the National Catholic Educational Association and other bodies concerned with higher education.

In no area of activity has this policy proved more fruitful than in the field of federal legislation. On each of three occasions when the chairman of our newly established Committee on Legislation testified before committees of the U. S. Congress, his testimony was coordinated with that offered on behalf of sister organizations: on the third occasion he appeared as a witness for the American Council on Education as well as the Association of American Colleges.

The testimony given related to the two subjects that have been the main concern of the Committee on Legislation during the first session of the 84th Congress: liberalization of the College Housing Program and appropriations made to the Department of State in support of the International Educational Exchange Program. The fact that higher education spoke with one voice seems to have been in both cases an important factor in securing congressional action more favorable than might otherwise have been expected.

In general the Board believes that the achievements of the Committee on Legislation in its first year have fully justified its establishment. For financial and practical reasons, the bulk of the Committee's work has had to be carried on through correspondence and the main burden has been borne by the chairman. Our increased financial resources will help to relieve the situation in 1956. In any case it seems appropriate that the Committee should continue to be personally appointed by the President from among presidents of member colleges located in the National Capital or within easy reach of it. The Board has agreed that, acting within the framework of policies laid down by the Association, the Committee on Legislation should exercise its own discretion about offering official testimony on behalf of our membership.

The legislation enacted by the Congress on selective service and the national reserve program is not completely in accord with the relevant resolution adopted by the last Annual Meeting of the Association. Largely through the efforts of the American Council on Education, however, the acts as finally passed take reasonable account of the needs of higher education.

Our recommendation of veterans' benefits for members of the armed forces in service on 31 January 1955 was followed in a measure enacted as Public Law 7.

Several Bills to provide tax relief in aid of tuition and fees for higher education were introduced during the past session of the Congress, but in spite of a considerable measure of bi-partisan support, they were not called up for debate. It is hoped however that a Bill embodying the Tax Credit Plan sponsored by the American Council on Education will receive sympathetic consideration in the coming session.

One of the subjects to which the directors have given a major share of attention is the improvement of college administration.

An important initiative in this field was taken by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in providing funds for an Institute for College and University Administrators, conducted by the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and sponsored by your Association. The experiment is generally agreed to have been a conspicuous success, and the Carnegie Corporation has since announced its intention of appropriating \$340,000 to finance the Institute on a five-year basis.

As was foreshadowed in the Board's last report, the President has appointed an Advisory Panel of experienced college presidents, active and retired, whose advice is available to presidents who may find themselves under the necessity of holding a hearing relative to termination of the employment of a faculty member. As a further aid to our members, the President has also appointed a Roster of Consultants whose members may be called into consultation by the president of any member college on problems of college administration. The directors take this opportunity of expressing their gratitude to the men and women who have generously undertaken to give of their time and energy in providing these services for their colleagues.

The project for joint action by this Association and the Amer-

ican Association of University Professors to establish standard procedures for hearings on faculty tenure cases was delayed by the long illness of the late Ralph E. Himstead. With the appointment of Dr. Ralph F. Fuchs as the new General Secretary of AAUP, however, active consideration of the project has been resumed.

Despite the strenuous efforts of the Executive Director to obtain foundation support for publication of "Notes for the College President," we still await a promise of the modest grant needed for this project.

Your directors have been gravely disturbed by irresponsible talk about a supposed conflict between public and private colleges. In order to make the position of this Association clear to all concerned, the Vice President was asked to prepare an address on the subject, which was delivered before the workshop organized by the Commission on Colleges and Industry in Indianapolis last August and was published in the October issue of our BULLETIN. Dr. Coons' salutary remarks are believed to have received wide currency.

At the same time, as there has been a great deal of speculative comment and a notable dearth of factual information on the part to be played by various types of institutions in meeting the increasing demand for higher education, the Board has authorized the Executive Director to make systematic inquiry of our member colleges about their enrolment plans for the coming years.

The Board has carefully considered the resolution adopted at the last Annual Meeting in favor of a nationwide study of scholarship policies and practices and has agreed that it would be inopportune for the Association to embark on such a study until the survey of scholarship facilities undertaken by the American Council on Education has been completed.

As a result of discussions between the Coe Foundation and the committee appointed by our President to draft a program for fostering American Studies, a start will be made in 1956 with summer sessions for high school teachers on the pattern set by the University of Wyoming. These experimental sessions, financed by a grant from the Coe Foundation, will be conducted on the campus of a relatively small liberal arts college.

The several commissions of the Association will report directly to the Annual Meeting on their activities of the past year, but the Board thinks it proper to draw attention to the outstanding developments made possible by the increasing volume of aid received from charitable foundations in support of action and study programs initiated by our commissions. The Board recommends that, rather than seeking to build up a large permanent staff, the Association should adopt a general policy of treating such activities as self-contained projects financed wherever possible by specific grants and administered, under the general guidance of the Executive Director and the appropriate advisory committees, by staff appointed for the duration of the respective projects.

From 1 January 1956 the Arts Program will receive the welcome support of an annual grant of \$5,000 from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, Inc. The Board has agreed that it is desirable in principle that the program should be financed entirely by foundation grants, but the current subvention from the general funds of the Association will not be so abruptly reduced as to prejudice the effective development of the program.

The Commission on Colleges and Industry has gone from strength to strength. Over and above the generous grant in aid of the Association's operating expenses, the Lilly Endowment, Inc. repeated its action of 1953 by meeting the cost of a second workshop organized by the Commission. In addition, through the generosity of six corporations and foundations, the Commission has been assured of a minimum annual revenue of \$40,000 to enable it to continue and expand its activities in the three years beginning 1 July 1955.

At a meeting of the Board held concurrently with the workshop of the Commission on Colleges and Industry in Indianapolis in August, it was formally resolved:

That the Board of Directors express the willingness of the Association of American Colleges to act until this resolution be rescinded as an ad hoc depository of funds received from corporations, partnerships, unions, individual persons, foundations or other sources for distribution to colleges, it being understood that all gifts shall be distributed in conformity with any designation made by the donors within a series of options to be determined by the Action Committee of the Commission on Colleges and Industry, one of which options must be distribution solely through state and regional fund-

raising associations and foundations, and that all undesigned gifts shall be distributed equally among all the members of the Association; and that the Commission on Colleges and Industry be requested to formulate a plan for a permanent national depository under the control of the Association for the consideration of the Board of Directors and the membership of the Association.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Commission on Teacher Education, the pilot study of the baccalaureate origins of college teachers reported by the Commission a year ago has been succeeded by a broader study financed by a grant of \$14,965 from The Fund for the Advancement of Education. The study covers the faculties of liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges and junior colleges and is directed by Dean Frank R. Kille of Carleton College with the help of an advisory committee representing all three types of institutions.

The preliminary discussions reported last year have led to the formulation of an experimental program for the selection and training of college teachers. Twenty-two member colleges have up to the present undertaken to share in the program and we aim to obtain foundation support on a five-year basis.

The amendment to Article I of the Constitution presented at the last Annual Meeting has been formally withdrawn by its proposers and the Board has agreed to recommend to the Association that no further action be taken on the proposed amendment.

The Board also recommends that the proposed amendment to Article VII, Section 1 be rephrased as follows:

Section 1. The Board of Directors shall consist of the officers of the Association during their respective terms of office, the retiring president during the year immediately following his term of office and four other directors elected by ballot by the Association. In the first election of directors after the adoption of this article, one director shall be elected for four years, one for three years, one for two years and one for one year. Thereafter one director shall be elected each year for a term of four years. If any director who is not an officer of the Association be elected an officer before the expiry of his term of four years, the unexpired portion of his term shall be filled by the election of a director to replace him. No director who has served for more than one year shall be eligible for re-election except as an officer of the Association until after the lapse of one year from the expiry of his most recent term of service.

Since there appears to be no constitutional authority for associate membership in the Association, the Board requested the Executive Director to invite the six overseas institutions listed as associate members to become regular members of the Association. Up to the present three of the six have accepted the invitation.

The Board proposes to try the experiment of selecting places for annual meetings of the Association in a six-year cycle providing for two meetings in the East, two in the Middle West, one in the South and one in the West.

The Board has approved the Editor's policy of encouraging our members to treat the BULLETIN as a medium of discussion as well as a record of Association activities. The Board has been reluctantly obliged to authorize increases in the subscription, reprint and advertising rates for the BULLETIN in order to meet increased production costs and make the BULLETIN more nearly self-supporting.

With the approval of the Board, the Association has borne since 1 September 1955 the cost of full participation by the headquarters staff in the hospitalization and surgery plans of Group Hospitalization, Inc. The Board has authorized the continuance of these arrangements in 1956.

Five meetings of the Board were held during the year: 13 January 1955 at the Hotel Statler in Washington, D. C., 4 March and 27 June at the offices of the Association, 25-26 August at the Columbia Club in Indianapolis and 9 January 1956 at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri.

The following colleges are recommended by the Board for election to membership in the Association:

Anna Maria College, Paxton, Massachusetts
Athens College, Athens, Alabama
Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, North Carolina
California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland, California
College of Notre Dame, Belmont, California
Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York
Marycrest College, Davenport, Iowa
Maryknoll Seminary, Glen Ellyn, Illinois
Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana
Our Lady of Cincinnati College, Cincinnati, Ohio
Rider College, Trenton, New Jersey
Texas Lutheran College, Seguin, Texas
University of St. Thomas, Houston, Texas
Walla Walla College, College Place, Washington.

REPORT OF TREASURER

J. OLLIE EDMUNDS
PRESIDENT, STETSON UNIVERSITY

SCHEDULE A STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

January 1, 1955 to December 31, 1955

Cash Balance, January 1, 1955 \$ 35,602.76

Receipts:

Membership dues:

For the year 1954 \$ 225.00
For the current year 53,385.00
For the year 1956, in advance 150.00

Total dues \$53,760.00

BULLETIN and reprints 5,086.40

Books and pamphlets 75.96

Interest on savings accounts 812.12

Transfer from Institute for College
and University Administrators for
administrative charge 4,000.00

Grant from Lilly Endowment, Inc., for
operating expenses for 1956 25,000.00

Total Receipts 88,734.48

\$124,337.24

Disbursements:

Apportionment of membership dues
to Arts Program \$ 7,090.00

Annual meeting expense 1,808.02

BULLETIN and reprints 9,101.95

Membership dues, A.C.E. *et al.* 225.00

Committees and commissions 2,853.59

Regional conferences 272.02

Administrative expenses:

Salaries \$33,858.30

Annuities, insurance,
hospitalization 4,246.67

Rent 4,005.00

Office expenses 2,687.74

Travel 1,181.80

Social Security taxes 370.64

Auditing 150.00

Office equipment 1,077.68

Total Administrative
Expenses 47,577.83

Total Disbursements \$ 68,928.41

Balance: December 31, 1955 \$ 55,408.83

SCHEDULE B

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
SPECIAL PROJECTS

January 1, 1955 to December 31, 1955

Arts Program

Balance, January 1, 1955	\$ 767.59
Receipts	33,001.10
	<u>33,768.69</u>
Disbursements	28,269.59
Balance, December 31, 1955	<u>\$ 5,499.10</u>

Commission on Teacher Education

Cash balance, January 1, 1955	\$479.40	
For exploratory meeting re improved selection, training and placement of college teachers		
Receipts:		
Balance of grant from		
The Edward W. Hazen Foundation	500.00	
Grant from The Fund for the Advancement of Education, for a study of the Baccalaureate Origins of College Faculties		\$ 7,500.00
	<u>\$979.40</u>	<u>\$ 7,500.00</u>
Disbursements:		
Office equipment and supplies		87.02
Travel expenses	214.05	1,199.77
Staff salaries		2,483.20
Cash balances, December 31, 1955	<u>\$765.35</u>	<u>\$ 3,730.01</u>

Institute for College and University Administrators

Receipts:		
Grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York		\$60,000.00
Disbursements		57,016.26
Cash balance, December 31, 1955		2,983.74
Balance refunded to Carnegie Corporation of New York		<u>2,983.74</u>

Commission on Colleges and Industry

Cash balance, January 1, 1955	\$5,060.03	
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Inc. ... grant to organize a clearing house of information		
Receipts:		
Grant from Lilly Foundation, Inc. for workshop	\$5,980.00	
Grants for Operating Expenses from:		
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Inc. ...		\$15,000.00
Standard Oil Foundation, Inc.		5,000.00
United States Steel Foundation		5,000.00
College Life Insurance Company of America		5,000.00
General Foods Fund, Inc.		5,000.00
General Electric Co.		5,000.00
	<u>\$5,060.03</u>	<u>\$5,980.00</u>
		<u>\$40,000.00</u>
Disbursements:		
Secretarial services	892.50	549.63
Office supplies	49.72	250.38
Printing	610.31	397.08
Travel	2,727.40	587.45
		<u>1,650.69</u>
		<u>6,392.19</u>

Report of Treasurer

153

Meetings	300.84		636.85
Telephone and telegrams	446.40	181.27	925.45
Social security	17.86		50.15
Miscellaneous		108.43	206.87
Postage	15.00	108.87	209.22
Executive salary			1,250.00
Travel expenses, delegates		2,578.00	
Meals, net		787.81	
Workshop proceedings, net		309.41	
Total Expenditures	\$5,060.03	\$5,607.95	\$14,082.61
Cash balance, December 31, 1955	\$ -00-	\$ 372.05	\$25,917.39

The following sums have been received by the Association acting as a national depository, for gifts to be distributed among member colleges in conformity with a resolution of the Board of Directors:

From—National Biscuit Company Foundation	\$13,000.00
Time, Inc.	10,000.00
Addressograph-Multigraph Corp.	1,000.00
A. S. Beck Shoe Corp.	200.00
	<u>\$24,200.00</u>

SCHEDULE C

STATEMENT OF CASH BALANCES

December 31, 1955

Funds

General Fund	\$ 55,408.83
Arts Program	5,499.10
Commission on Colleges and Industry	26,289.44
Commission on Teacher Education	4,495.36
Gifts received to be distributed among member colleges	24,200.00
Total	<u>\$115,892.73</u>

Composed of Balances in:

Union Trust Company of the District of Columbia	\$ 22,443.25
Merchants National Bank, Indianapolis, Indiana	40,489.44
Northfield National Bank, Northfield, Minn.	3,730.01
Bowery Savings Bank, New York	9,397.85
Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, New York	10,704.00
Franklin Savings Bank, New York	9,128.18
First Federal Savings & Loan Association, D. C.	10,000.00
Perpetual Building Association, D. C.	10,000.00
Total (as above)	<u>\$115,892.73</u>

SCHEDULE D

BALANCE SHEET

December 31, 1955

Assets

Cash in banks	\$115,892.73
Choral Music at book value	9,300.00
Total	<u>\$125,192.73</u>

Funds

General Fund	\$ 55,408.83
Arts Program	5,499.10
Commission on Colleges and Industry	26,289.44
Commission on Teacher Education	4,495.36
Gifts received, to be distributed among member colleges	24,200.00
Choral Music at book value	9,300.00
Total (as above)	<u>\$125,192.73</u>

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

THEODORE A. DISTLER

IN spite of the many problems besetting us on every hand, I am encouraged by the evidence I see of growing concern on the part of thoughtful Americans in all walks of life for the contribution that education must make to our national well-being. They are giving serious attention to the problem of translating our educational ideals into dollars and cents and, still more important, people. At the same time they are increasingly coming to recognize that education is not a commodity to be measured by the yard or the ton. An activity whose central concern is with the quality of life must be judged by the quality of its own achievement.

If education is to make good its claim to a larger share of our national resources, it must show that it can make effective use of it. The parable of the talents should be underlined in every educator's Bible. But effectiveness can be gauged only by reference to the end to be pursued. How can we tell whether our schools are doing a good job unless we have a clear idea of what their job is? We therefore find ourselves obliged to reconsider not only the methods but the goals of education in a mobile, industrial, democratic society. We cannot expect to find solutions for all these problems in the space of a year or two, but it is encouraging to see that other people besides professional educators are prepared to grapple with them. The past year has been marked by greatly increased recognition of the citizen's responsibility for education.

The most striking demonstration of this concern was the White House Conference on Education and the hundreds of state and local conferences that led up to it. Whatever our individual views of the procedures followed or the conclusions reached at the White House Conference, there can, I think, be no question that the biggest town meeting in our history was a splendid example of American democracy in action and a heart-warming proof of public interest in one of the central problems of our society.

This same year has seen the inauguration of the largest inde-

pendent scholarship program in the history of American education—the National Merit Scholarship Program. The conception of the program and the welcome it has received are further evidence of the growing concern for practical realization of our educational ideals. The wisdom of the sponsoring foundations in providing opportunities for other organizations to join in the program has already been demonstrated by the adherence of half a dozen major national corporations. If their example is followed, as the sponsors have every right to expect, the National Merit Scholarship Program will achieve results out of all proportion to the initial grants, generous as they are, and may point the way to a solution of one of the main problems of educational opportunity.

But by all odds the most thrilling news for American higher education in 1955 was the Ford Foundation's grant of \$260,000,000 to 615 of our private colleges and universities. The sheer size of the gift has long since exhausted our stock of superlatives. There is no need for me to add my own eulogies of its dazzling munificence or to express the heartfelt gratitude of our members. I am concerned mainly with what the gift implies.

In reporting to you 12 months ago, I was bold enough to address a homily to foundations and other benefactors on the need of providing our colleges with fresh capital through endowment funds. I am not so vain as to claim that my words had any part in stimulating the Ford grant, but I cannot help expressing my personal satisfaction that it has taken the form of capital gifts to be treated as endowment for at least a minimum number of years. I am unrepentant in my view that increased endowment is among the most fundamental of our needs.

This is not to minimize annual giving from whatever source. I know how proud you are of the splendid work of our Commission on Colleges and Industry, not to mention the fine work of the American Alumni Council, the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel and the Council for Financial Aid to Education, all of which have our wholehearted support.

Some of you may feel sorry that the Ford Foundation did not make its grants conditional on the raising of matching funds, whether in the form of annual contributions or further additions to endowment. Without any such formal conditions, however,

it is perfectly clear that the Foundation wishes its gifts to be an example and a stimulus to other givers. For all its astronomical size, the direct impact of the Ford grant cannot make more than a small dent in the salary problem. The Foundation itself was first to proclaim that it was the moral effect of its action that would count. The challenge has been issued to foundations, corporations, individual persons of wealth, alumni, parents and all other friends of higher education throughout the length and breadth of the land. I am confident of their response.

The statesmanship of this historic act of philanthropy lies of course in its being directed toward the improvement of teachers' salaries. In announcing the original appropriation of \$50,000,000—now dwarfed by the actual grant—Mr. Henry Ford himself gave forceful expression to this crucial issue for higher education. "All the objectives of higher education," he said, "ultimately depend on the quality of teaching. In the opinion of the Foundation Trustees, private and corporate philanthropy can make no better investment of its resources than in helping to strengthen American education at its base—the quality of its teaching. . . . Nowhere are the needs of the private colleges more apparent than in the matter of faculty salaries." Mr. Ford and his co-trustees have shown that they practice what they preach.

The problem of finding and keeping good teachers is one of the most serious concerns of this Association. We are faced with the brute fact that even if all the men and women who are expected to obtain doctorates in the next few years were suited to teaching, and were in fact to become college teachers in spite of the competition of industry and government, we should still be short of teachers. It is not just a matter of economics, of course, though for most people material rewards are a major factor in the choice of a profession. The problem involves questions of motivation which derive ultimately from the failure of our society to give due recognition to the vital role of the teacher. Too few of the young men and women who are intellectually and morally qualified to teach want to be teachers.

This is a problem to which the Board of Directors has given much anxious thought. As a first, modest step toward finding a solution we have undertaken the Baccalaureate Origins Study under the direction of Dean Frank R. Kille. It is a simple fact-

finding project intended to throw light on the problem by analyzing the academic origins of the present teaching body—whether in liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges or junior colleges. Secondly, we are planning an experimental program for identifying, encouraging and helping undergraduate students who are potential teachers. Unless a better and more comprehensive program is devised, we hope to obtain foundation support to enable us to try our program for five years in a small group of member colleges.

Other organizations, such as the Social Science Research Council and the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Program, are already providing graduate scholarships for prospective teachers. But, as the President of the University of Illinois pointed out in addressing the Land-Grant Colleges last November, all these programs put together will furnish only a few hundred teachers a year out of the thousands needed. Some of the major foundations, like The Fund for the Advancement of Education, are giving earnest attention to the problem. I am sure that they can rely on the full cooperation of our member colleges in any programs they may put forward.

I am equally sure that no program will be effective that does not start from the grass roots. Whatever financial or other help is needed from outside, the main effort will have to be made on the individual campus. At the last annual meeting of the American Council on Education it was agreed that the greatest single factor in encouraging students to become teachers is the active interest of the present faculty—and that there is not enough of it. Behind this lies the need for convincing our fellow citizens of the social worth of the teaching profession. Mr. Ford spoke truly of helping to strengthen American education at its base. Unless our nation is moved by **his precept and his example**, it will find its educational system withering at the roots.

The generous reception given to the Ford grant by spokesmen of public institutions—which are not beneficiaries—was a welcome change from the brickbats that have been hurled in recent months by self-appointed champions in a silly squabble over the relative merits of public and private colleges. Your Directors have spared no pains to make it clear that this Association, as the national organization of liberal arts colleges, public and private,

stands firm in the view that there is a place for both types of institutions in the American system of higher education. Nobody now knows—though some people talk as if they knew—what share of the student population will fall to each type of institution in the next few years. We shall have a better idea when we have carried out our projected survey of our members' enrolment plans. As the Board has stated in its report, cooperation designed to achieve the greatest possible unity of effort in higher education has been the keynote of our policy. Without such unity, how can we hope to solve the tremendous problems that face us? Never was it more truly said that if we don't hang together we shall assuredly hang separately.

Another crucial problem with which we have been greatly preoccupied in the past year is the quality of college administration. It does not make sense for corporations and private benefactors to give colleges money unless they are satisfied that the colleges can run their business efficiently. But we all know that college administration leaves a lot to be desired. Financial considerations apart, it absorbs a good deal of blood, toil, tears and sweat that might be saved. Trustees, presidents, deans and administrators in general could all use some help toward doing a better job: some need help in learning exactly what their job is. The individuals are more to be pitied than blamed, as until just lately there has been no machinery for providing them with any training.

A splendid start has now been made through the initiative of the Carnegie Corporation of New York in establishing, with the help of the Harvard Business School, the Institute for College and University Administrators. I hope you have all read in the December BULLETIN about the session held at Harvard last June, under the sponsorship of our Association, for newly appointed presidents and their wives. If not, you might ask some of your colleagues who took part in the session what they thought of it. Now the Carnegie Corporation has announced the appropriation of \$340,000 to continue the Institute for five more years. A second session for presidents is planned for next June, in which we shall again be privileged to play an important part, and I am hopeful that later on the Institute will be able to extend its activities to other branches of college administration. I feel

honored that, as your Executive Director, I have been invited to serve along with some of our outstanding teachers and administrators as a member of the advisory board of the Institute. I am convinced that it represents one of the most significant developments for higher education in many years.

Against this background of spectacular events, your staff at headquarters has been quietly striving to effect every possible improvement in the day-to-day services it seeks to render our members. Above all, we have tried to broaden and deepen our knowledge of their aims and aspirations, their plans and problems. We have welcomed to our offices a steady stream of presidents and other friends from the colleges. When our combination of library and visitors' room is ready, we shall be able to offer them better hospitality. Conversely, my assistant and I have between us visited some 40 member colleges on one kind of mission or another in the course of the year.

In pursuance of the Directors' policy of cooperation, we have also kept in close touch with the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government and with all the principal organizations concerned with higher education. In particular we have, together or separately, attended the annual meetings of the

American Alumni Council

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities

American Council on Education

Association of College Admissions Counselors

Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association

College English Association Institute for Liberal Education and Industry

Federation of Illinois Colleges

Indiana Council on Religion in Higher Education

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Presbyterian Educational Association

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

In addition of course to numerous representatives of member colleges, the Association has been officially represented by Mr. Wormald at the

White House Conference on Education
Fifth National Conference of voluntary organizations convened by the U. S. National Commission for Unesco, and
Sixtieth Annual Congress of American Industry convened by the National Association of Manufacturers.

With greater resources at our disposal in the coming year, we aim to improve our services still further and shall welcome your guidance on the directions in which our efforts might be most usefully applied. The Lilly grant will be used mainly to facilitate the work of the commissions and committees of the Association, but we hope that at the same time the Executive Director and his staff will be able to maintain closer contact with our membership.

At this point I should like to record my deepest gratitude to the President and the Board of Directors for their sympathetic understanding of the problems confronting the Association and their excellent guidance. I am particularly grateful to them for their enthusiastic support in the building of a small but effective staff in Washington. The other members of my staff will understand if I express a special word of commendation for Mr. Wormald who in the short time he has been with us has done a tremendous job both in the office and in the field. I am indebted to the chairmen and members of the several commissions for their increased activity, even at a time when we could not provide them with adequate funds for functioning. My hearty thanks go too to all the college presidents who often at inconvenience to themselves represented the Association at various official gatherings at colleges and universities. Indeed I am grateful to you all, for no Director could have had finer cooperation from the members of his organization than I have had.

When all is said and done, we are only the instruments of your purposes. The Association of American Colleges is your association and will be as good as you make it.

You have a heavy responsibility in seeing to it that liberal education in the United States meets the challenge of our age. In the true spirit of conservatism, you must hold fast to the unchanging values that justify liberal education, while welcoming any new means of attaining its aims in changing times. I suspect that some of these means will be radical and will involve a sacrifice of prejudices—though not of principles. Higher edu-

cation is an activity that of its very nature demands constant self-evaluation.

You will have to be as courageous in facing your limitations as in grasping your opportunities. You will have to proclaim as clearly and firmly what the four-year college cannot do as what it can and should do. A large part of the flood of new students may have to be taken care of by new forms of post-secondary education provided by new types of institutions. This would surely be better than trying to force them into traditional molds that may not be suited to their needs and capacities.

In our efforts to find and keep good teachers, we shall have to adopt fringe benefits and more flexible retirement rules as well as paying better salaries. It is high time we took a fresh look at the qualifications required for college teaching and particularly at Ph.D. programs. In order to make the best use of the teachers we have, we must be prepared to try any device, mechanical or administrative, that will enable them to handle more students. There is nothing sacrosanct about any particular student-teacher ratio, and close personal contact between teacher and student is not necessary at every point in the educational process.

It might be worth our while to take a leaf from the European book by treating more of our students like adults and giving them greater responsibility for planning and carrying out their own programs.

I hope some time we shall give serious attention to the needed revision in the American academic calendar, which seems to me educationally unjustifiable in terms of a sound learning program.

Above all, we need to give continuous thought to improving our curricula. We can no longer afford—in any sense of the word—to carry a loosely tied bundle of fragmented courses. Every single institution will have to decide for itself what are the essential elements of a liberal education and how they are to be reconciled with legitimate vocational needs.

And all this endeavor must be made in a spirit of friendly collaboration and mutual aid. Competition in service is fundamental to our society, but the way of progress is the way of co-operation, never the way of division. In that spirit we have tried to carry on the work of the Association and, with God's blessing and your support, will continue to do so.

REPRESENTATION OF THE ASSOCIATION IN 1955

THE following presidents of member colleges acted as official delegates of the Association on the occasions indicated:

January 7. President Philip E. Dobson, Canisius College.
Inauguration of Chancellor Clifford C. Furnas, University of Buffalo.

January 20. President Hurst R. Anderson, American University. Inauguration of President Wilson H. Elkins, University of Maryland.

January 29. President William C. Finch, Southwestern University. Inauguration of President Arthur Tyson, Mary Hardin-Baylor College.

February 22-25. President George N. Shuster, Hunter College of the City of New York. National Conference on Exchange of Persons sponsored by the Institute of International Education, New York City.

February 27. President Theodore Pierson Stephens, Aurora College. Inauguration of President Leland H. Carlson, Rockford College.

March 15. President Lloyd S. Cressman, Friends University. Inauguration of President C. Orville Strohl, Southwestern College.

March 28. President Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College. Inauguration of Provost Clark G. Kuebler, Santa Barbara College, University of California and the dedication of the new campus.

April 1-2. President Lether E. Frazar, McNeese State College. Formal opening of the Graduate School and inauguration of President John S. Kyser, Northwestern State College.

April 5-7. President M. Ellis Drake, Alfred University. The College English Association Institute for Liberal Education and Industry, Schenectady.

May 6. President Sharvy G. Umbeck, Knox College. Inauguration of President Harold P. Rodes, Bradley University.

May 20-21. President W. Terry Wickham, Heidelberg College. Conference on Methods of Financing Higher Education sponsored by the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

- May 22. President Merrill J. Holmes, Illinois Wesleyan University. Inauguration of President Ira W. Langston, Eureka College.
- June 3. President A. Ray Olpin, University of Utah. Inauguration of President Daryl Chase, Utah State Agricultural College.
- June 5. President Matthew D. Smith, Dakota Wesleyan University. Inauguration of President Adrian Rondileau, Yankton College.
- June 20. President J. Paul Leonard, San Francisco State College. Meeting of the United States Committee for the United Nations and 10th Anniversary Celebration of the United Nations, San Francisco.
- July 11. President William H. Gill, Colorado College. Dedication of the United States Air Force Academy, Denver.
- August 7. President Peyton N. Rhodes, Southwestern, Memphis. Dedication of Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel.
- August 21-31. President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas and President Charles J. Turek, Macalester College. Eighth National Student Congress, U. S. National Student Association, University of Minnesota.
- September 28. President F. Pendleton Gaines, Wofford College. Inauguration of President C. A. Kaufmann, Newberry College.
- October 8. President Harry David Gideonse, Brooklyn College. Convocation celebrating the Centennial Anniversary of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.
- October 14. President E. N. Jones, Texas Technological College. Inauguration of President Dysart Edgar Holcomb, Texas Western College.
- October 22. President William W. Hall, Franklin and Marshall College. Centennial Homecoming Convocation, Albright College.
- October 29. President Ambrose J. Burke, St. Ambrose College. Inauguration of President Millard G. Roberts, Parsons College.
- October 29. President Paul L. O'Connor, Xavier University. Inauguration of President Walter C. Langsam, University of Cincinnati.
- October 31-November 1. President Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College. Seventh Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities, California Institute of Technology on October 31 and University of California at Los Angeles on November 1.

November 3. President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University. Inauguration of President William Henry Dennis, Jr., Albany State College.

November 4. President George M. Modlin, University of Richmond. Inauguration of President Samuel D. Proctor, Virginia Union University.

November 11. President Eugene S. Farley, Wilkes College. Inauguration of President D. Frederick Wertz, Lycoming College.

December 12. President Orville W. Wake, Lynchburg College. Inauguration of President Francis G. Lankford, Jr., Longwood College.

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS

Minutes of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges

10-12 January 1956
Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri

Theme: "Liberal Education: Scholarship and Teaching"

Opening Session

THE forty-second Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges was called to order at 8:00 P.M., Tuesday, 10 January 1956 by the President, the Very Reverend Joseph R. N. Maxwell, President of Boston College. The invocation was offered by President Carl C. Bracy of Mount Union College. Some 700 delegates attended the meeting.

President Maxwell reported the appointment of the following committees:

Committee on Nominations

Chancellor Emeritus R. H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*

President Armand H. Desautels, Assumption College

President Robert P. Ludlum, Blackburn College

President Earl J. McGrath, University of Kansas City

President Clarence C. Stoughton, Wittenberg College

Committee on Resolutions

President Peyton N. Rhodes, Southwestern at Memphis, *Chairman*

President S. C. Eastvold, Pacific Lutheran College

President Louis W. Norris, MacMurray College

President Rosemary Park, Connecticut College

President Andrew C. Smith, Spring Hill College

The President announced that at the close of the session balloting would begin on the amendments presented at the 41st Annual Meeting to Articles III and VII of the Constitution and to By-Law 2. The proposed amendment to Article I of the Constitution, having been withdrawn by its proposers, was not put to the vote.

President Goodrich C. White of Emory University gave an address entitled *Do We Believe in Education?*

Dr. Russell Kirk, Editor of *The Conservative Review*, then

addressed the meeting on *Liberal Learning, Moral Worth and Defecated Rationality*.

Second General Session

President Maxwell called the second general session to order at 9:00 A.M., Wednesday, 11 January. The invocation was offered by President D. W. Bittering of McPherson College.

President Arthur G. Coons of Occidental College, Vice President of the Association, presented the report of the Board of Directors on the activities of the Association in the past year and the Board's recommendations for future action. On motion the report was received and the Board's recommendations adopted.

President J. Ollie Edmunds, Treasurer of the Association, presented his report, embodying the auditor's statement on the management of the Association's funds during the past year. On motion the report was approved.

The Executive Director presented his report, reviewing the work of his office and the problems facing the Association. On motion the report was received.

The report of the Commission on Christian Higher Education was presented by Chairman Harold L. Yochum, President of Capital University, and the report of the Commission on International Cooperation through Education by Chairman Francis S. Hutchins, President of Berea College. On motion each of the two reports was received and adopted.

Sectional Meetings

At 10:30 A.M. the meeting divided into three sectional meetings.

Section 1, under the chairmanship of Vice President Coons, heard a paper by Ernest T. Stewart, Jr., Executive Secretary of the American Alumni Council, on *Alumni Funds and Annual Giving*.

Discussion was led by a panel composed of:

President Sarah G. Blanding, Vassar College

Reverend John J. Cavanaugh, Director, University of Notre Dame Foundation

President Daniel Z. Gibson, Washington College

President James H. Hilton, Iowa State College
President Courtney C. Smith, Swarthmore College

The section was then addressed by President Martin D. Whitaker of Lehigh University on *College Development Programs*.

Discussion was led by a panel composed of:

Charles Anger, Chairman, Executive Committee, John Price Jones Company, Inc.

President John D. Millett, Miami University

Louis W. Robey, Vice President, Marts and Lundy, Inc.

Section 2, presided over by President Richard D. Weigle of St. John's College, Chairman of the Commission on Liberal Education, heard two papers on *The Teacher and Himself*.

Dean Thomas S. Hall of Washington University spoke on *What Makes a Good Teacher?* and Sister Mary Emil of Marygrove College on *What Keeps a Good Teacher Alive?*

Discussion was led by a panel composed of:

Professor Theodore Ashford, Saint Louis University

Dean Robert R. R. Brooks, Williams College

Professor Barry Commoner, Washington University

President Frederick Hard, Scripps College

Professor Hiram L. Jome, DePauw University

Section 3, under the chairmanship of President Paul Swain Havens of Wilson College, considered *External Problems of Women's Colleges*.

Papers were presented by

President Katherine G. Blyley of Keuka College on *Public Relations for the Women's Colleges*,

President Louis W. Norris of MacMurray College on *The Role of Women in American Economic Life* and

President Otto F. Kraushaar of Goucher College on *Industrial Support for the Women's Colleges*.

The papers were followed by discussion from the floor.

Third General Session

The Wednesday afternoon session opened at 2:00 P.M. under the chairmanship of President Harold L. Yochum, of Capital University, Chairman of the Commission on Christian Higher Education. The invocation was offered by President R. E. Morton of Dana College, Nebraska.

Addresses on *Liberal Education: Scholarship and Teaching, with Particular Reference to Christian Education* were given by

the Reverend Theodore A. Gill, Associate Editor of *The Christian Century*, and the Reverend Robert J. Henle, Dean of the Graduate School, Saint Louis University.

Sectional Meetings

The three sectional meetings were resumed at 4:00 P.M.

Section 1, with Vice President Coons in the chair, heard papers on *The Work of Charitable Foundations* from:

Howard C. Baldwin, Vice President of the Kresge Foundation

G. Harold Duling, Secretary of the Lilly Endowment

John W. Gardner, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York

William McPeak, Vice President of the Ford Foundation.

The papers were followed by questions and discussion from the floor.

Section 2, under the chairmanship of President H. Ellis Finger, Jr. of Millsaps College, a member of the Commission on Teacher Education, heard two papers on *Teaching and the Student*.

Dean Byron K. Trippet of Wabash College spoke on *Teaching: a Teacher's Appraisal* and Millard Susman, a senior in the College of Liberal Arts, Washington University, on *Teaching: a Student's Appraisal*.

Discussion was led by a panel composed of:

Sister Mary Edwin De Coursey, St. Mary College

Professor Merton French, Washburn University

Vice President George Huff, Drake University

Professor O. H. Smith, Grinnell College

Section 3, under the chairmanship of President Frederick Hard of Scripps College, turned to consideration of *Domestic Problems of Women's Colleges*.

Papers were presented by:

President Anne Gary Pannell of Sweet Briar College on *Admissions*

Dean Meribeth E. Cameron of Mount Holyoke College on *Scholarships*

President Rosemary Park of Connecticut College on *Faculty Salaries*

President Paul R. Anderson of Chatham College on *Alumnae Associations*.

After discussion from the floor, the deliberations of the section

were summarized by President Wallace M. Alston of Agnes Scott College.

Annual Dinner of the Association

The Annual Dinner was held at 7:00 P.M. with President Maxwell presiding. Prayer was offered by President Robert J. Slavin of Providence College. Musical entertainment was furnished by the Saint Louis University Choir under the direction of William B. Heyne and the Washington University Opera Workshop under the direction of Dorothy Ziegler.

The guest of honor was A. D. P. Heeney, Canadian Ambassador to the United States, who gave an address on *The College and the Community*.

Fifth General Session

The Thursday morning session was called to order by Vice President Coons at 9:00 A.M. on 12 January. The invocation was offered by President R. V. Kavanagh of Carroll College, Montana.

The chairman announced that, in the balloting on amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws, the amendments to Articles III and VII of the Constitution had both been adopted unanimously and the amendment to By-Law 2 had been adopted by the necessary majority.

The reports of Standing Commissions and Committees were presented as follows:

Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure by Chairman Louis T. Benezet, President of Colorado College

Arts by President Daniel Z. Gibson of Washington College, who acted as chairman of the Commission in the absence abroad of Chairman Calvert N. Ellis

Colleges and Industry by Chairman Frank H. Sparks, President of Wabash College

Insurance and Annuities by Chairman Mark H. Ingraham, Dean of the College of Letters and Science, University of Wisconsin

Liberal Education by Chairman Richard D. Weigle, President of St. John's College

Preprofessional Education by Chairman O. P. Kretzmann, President of Valparaiso University

Teacher Education by President H. Ellis Finger, Jr. of Millsaps College, acting for Chairman Russell D. Cole who was abroad.

On motion each of these reports was received and adopted as presented, excepting the report of the Commission on Teacher Education, which was adopted with amendments proposed from the floor.

President Maxwell then took the chair.

Chairman R. H. Fitzgerald reported for the Committee on Nominations. On motion the report was adopted. The names of the officers and commission or committee members so elected are printed in the opening pages of the *Bulletin*.

President Peyton N. Rhodes, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, presented the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Be it resolved that the members of the Association of American Colleges extend their thanks and congratulations to the Very Reverend Joseph R. N. Maxwell, to Theodore A. Distler and to the Board of Directors for the wise and effective leadership they have given to the Association during the past year.

Be it also resolved that the members of the Association express their appreciation of the work of the several commissions and committees and of the excellent program of the 42nd Annual Meeting devoted to the theme *Liberal Education: Scholarship and Teaching*.

Be it resolved that the Association record its appreciation of the grant of \$50,000 from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., to strengthen and extend the activities of the commissions and committees of the Association.

Be it resolved that the Association express its appreciation of the grant of \$5,000 from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, Inc. for the support of the Arts Program of the Association for the year 1956.

Be it resolved that the Association record its thanks for the grant of \$14,965 from The Fund for the Advancement of Education for the financing of a study under the direction of Dean Frank R. Kille of the baccalaureate origins of faculty members in liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges and junior colleges.

Be it resolved that the Association express its appreciation to the following for their contributions to the work of the Commission on Colleges and Industry: Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, \$15,000; College Life Insurance Company of America, \$5,000;

General Electric Educational and Charitable Fund, \$5,000; General Foods Fund, Inc., \$5,000; Standard Oil Foundation, Inc. (Indiana), \$5,000; and United States Steel Foundation, Inc., \$5,000.

Be it resolved that the Association express its great appreciation to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for its grant of \$60,000 to support experimentally the Institute for College and University Administrators in June 1955 and for the Corporation's appropriation of \$340,000 to establish the Institute for the next five years, and

Be it further resolved that the Association accept the invitation of the Carnegie Corporation to act as a sponsoring organization of the Institute for College and University Administrators.

Be it resolved that the Association notes with profound gratitude and appreciation the recent magnificent action of the Ford Foundation in making provision for grants to American privately endowed colleges and universities in the amount of \$260,000,000 to assist in increasing faculty salaries. It commends the Ford Foundation for this forward-looking program and recommends to the Foundation and other charitable foundations that ways and means be sought to assist in safeguarding American higher education. These Ford Foundation grants, in magnitude and purpose, establish a landmark in educational philanthropy.

Be it resolved that the Association approve Title III of the Housing Amendments of 1955 passed by the Congress of the United States to liberalize the provisions of the College Housing Program and would regret any amendment of the present law that would tend to restrict the assistance afforded by the Program as now constituted relating to the provision of needed housing and dining facilities for the colleges and universities.

Be it resolved that the Association is convinced of the value of educational and cultural exchange programs for the promotion of international understanding and urges the Congress of the United States to make substantially increased appropriations for the International Education Exchange Program of the Department of State.

Be it resolved that the Association reaffirm its support of the principle of personal income tax relief as an aid to reducing the cost of higher education, and to that end urge the Congress of

the United States to enact legislation embodying the tax credit plan sponsored by the American Council on Education.

Be it resolved that the Association reaffirm its resolution of 1955 endorsing the Supreme Court decision with respect to racial segregation in the public schools as a "significant milestone in the long road to equality and freedom."

Be it resolved that the Association record its lasting appreciation of the widespread and increasing financial support of institutions of higher learning by far-sighted business and industrial leaders and commends with enthusiasm all measures which will effectively broaden and strengthen such regular and sustained support.

Whereas the Association, meeting in St. Louis, the city of William H. Danforth's long residence and notable business achievements, has learned with deep regret of the recent death of Mr. Danforth,

Be it resolved that the Association express its profound appreciation to the Danforth Foundation which he established for the encouragement and support of students and faculty members in so many of its member colleges by emphasizing moral and spiritual factors in education.

Be it resolved that the Association express its deep and heartfelt thanks and appreciation to Dr. Frank H. Sparks for the great vision and effective leadership he has given to the Commission on Colleges and Industry, and

Be it further resolved that the Association express its great pleasure upon being informed that Dr. Sparks will, after 1 February, 1956, following his release from the presidency of Wabash College, give gratuitously of his service to the Association as Chairman of the Commission on Colleges and Industry, and looks forward to the continuation of his wise and alert guidance.

Be it resolved that the Association record its deep indebtedness and warm appreciation to Chancellor and Mrs. Ethan A. H. Shepley of Washington University and to President Paul C. Reinert of Saint Louis University and their staffs for many acts of kindness, courtesy and assistance beyond the call of duty, all of which combined to make this meeting of the Association both pleasant and profitable.

After a brief recess, Lyman H. Butterfield, Editor in Chief of *The Adams Papers*, gave an address on *Rediscovering the Founding Fathers*.

Final Session

The Annual Meeting closed with the customary luncheon, with President Maxwell presiding. Prayer was offered by President James A. Colston of Knoxville College.

Since the guest of honor, Herold C. Hunt, Under Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, was unavoidably detained on official business in Washington, the text of the address he was to have given on *Liberal Arts: The Years Ahead* was circulated at the meeting. In his place, President Franc L. McCluer of Lindenwood College gave a brief address on the same subject.

The Annual Meeting adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

* * * * *

The Commissions and Committees of the Association held their regular meetings on 10 January, immediately before the Annual Meeting. On the same day the American Conference of Academic Deans held its 12th annual meeting. Meetings of a large number of church groups concerned with higher education were also held in the week beginning 8 January.

* * * * *

The wives of member presidents held a well-attended meeting in the morning of 11 January, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Ethan A. H. Shepley, wife of the Chancellor of Washington University, and heard an address by President Blanche H. Dow of Cottey College on *Partners in Liberal Education*. The group was then entertained to luncheon at the St. Louis Art Museum by Saint Louis and Washington Universities and, after a conducted tour of St. Louis, took tea with Mrs. Shepley at her home.

* * * * *

BY VOTE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, THE NEXT ANNUAL MEETING IS TO BE HELD AT THE BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, 8-10 JANUARY, 1957.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE YEAR ENDING JANUARY, 1957

THEODORE A. DISTLER
Executive Director

726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.
120 W. 58th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1956-57

President: Arthur G. Coons, *President, Occidental College*
Vice President: J. Ollie Edmunds, *President, Stetson University*
Treasurer: William W. Whitehouse, *President, Albion College*
Executive Director: Theodore A. Distler
Past President: Joseph R. N. Maxwell, *President, Boston College*
Additional Members of the Board of Directors:
 1957—Frank H. Sparks, *Chairman, Board of Trustees, Wabash College*
 1958—G. D. Humphrey, *President, University of Wyoming*
 1959—David A. Lockmiller, *President, University of Chattanooga*
 1960—Vincent A. McQuade, *President, Merrimack College*
Executive Director Emeritus: Guy E. Snavely, *Chancellor, Birmingham-Southern College*

By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the university college of liberal arts. Unless otherwise indicated the name of the president or the chancellor is given in the column headed Executive Officer.

INSTITUTION

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

ALABAMA

Alabama College, Montevilla	F. Edward Lund
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn	Ralph B. Draughon
Athens College, Athens	Perry B. James
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham	Guy E. Snavely
Howard College, Birmingham	Harwell G. Davis
Huntingdon College, Montgomery	Hubert Searcy
Judson College, Marion	J. I. Riddle
Miles College, Birmingham	W. A. Bell
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill	Andrew C. Smith
Talladega College, Talladega	Arthur D. Gray
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee	Luther H. Foster
University of Alabama, University	Oliver C. Carmichael

ALASKA

University of Alaska, College Ernest N. Patty

ARIZONA

Arizona State College, Tempe Grady Gammage

University of Arizona, Tucson Richard A. Harvill

ARKANSAS

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff

Lawrence A. Davis

Arkansas State College, Jonesboro Carl R. Reng

College of the Ozarks, Clarksville Winslow S. Drummond

Harding College, Searcy George Stuart Benson

Hendrix College, Conway Matt L. Ellis

Onachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia Ralph A. Phelps, Jr.

Philander Smith College, Little Rock M. LaFayette Harris

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville John T. Caldwell

CALIFORNIA

California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland D. S. Defenbacher

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena Lee A. DuBridge

Claremont Men's College, Claremont George C. S. Benson

College of Notre Dame, Belmont Sister Teresa Augustine

College of the Holy Names, Oakland Sister Imelda Maria

College of the Pacific, Stockton Robert E. Burns

Dominican College, San Rafael Sister Mary Patrick

George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles Hugh M. Tiner

Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles Sister Mary Thecla

La Sierra College, Arlington Norval F. Pease

La Verne College, La Verne Harold D. Fasnacht

Loyola University, Los Angeles Charles S. Casassa

Mills College, Oakland Lynn T. White, Jr.

Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles Mother Rosemary Lyons

Occidental College, Los Angeles Arthur G. Coons

Pacific Union College, Angwin H. L. Sonnenberg

Pasadena College, Pasadena Westlake T. Purkiser

Pomona College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont E. Wilson Lyon

St. Mary's College, St. Mary's College P. O. Brother W. Thomas

San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco Mother Marian Kent

San Francisco State College, San Francisco J. Paul Leonard

Scripps College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont Frederick Hard

Stanford University, Stanford University J. E. Wallace Sterling

University of Redlands, Redlands George H. Armacost

University of San Francisco, San Francisco John F. X. Connolly

University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara Herman Hauck

University of Southern California, Los Angeles Fred D. Fagg, Jr.

Whittier College, Whittier Paul S. Smith

COLORADO

Colorado College, Colorado Springs	Louis T. Benezet
Loretto Heights College, Loretto	Sister Frances Marie
Regis College, Denver	Richard F. Ryan
University of Colorado, Boulder	Ward Darley
University of Denver, Denver	Chester M. Alter

CONNECTICUT

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven	Sister Mary Lucia
Connecticut College, New London	Rosemary Park
Fairfield University, Fairfield	Joseph D. Fitzgerald
Saint Joseph College, West Hartford	Sister M. Theodore, <i>Dean</i>
Trinity College, Hartford	Albert C. Jacobs
University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport	James H. Halsey
Wesleyan University, Middletown	Victor L. Butterfield
Yale University, New Haven	A. Whitney Griswold

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American University, Washington	Hurst R. Anderson
Catholic University of America, Washington	Bryan J. McEntegart
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, Washington	Sister M. Mildred Dolores
George Washington University, Washington	C. H. Marvin
Georgetown University, Washington	Edward B. Bunn
Howard University, Washington	Mordecai W. Johnson
Trinity College, Washington	Sister Mary Patrick
Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park	William H. Shephard

FLORIDA

Barry College, Miami	Sister M. Dorothy, <i>Dean</i>
Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach	Richard V. Moore
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee	George W. Gore, Jr.
Florida Normal and Industrial Memorial College, St. Augustine	R. W. Puryear
Florida Southern College, Lakeland	Ludd M. Spivey
Florida State University, Tallahassee	Doak S. Campbell
Rollins College, Winter Park	Hugh F. McKean
Stetson University, DeLand	J. Ollie Edmunds
University of Florida, Gainesville	J. Wayne Reitz
University of Miami, Coral Gables	Jay F. W. Pearson
University of Tampa, Tampa	Ellwood C. Nance

GEORGIA

Agnes Scott College, Decatur	Wallace M. Alston
Atlanta University, Atlanta	Rufus E. Clement
Berry College, Mount Berry	Robert S. Lambert

Bessie Tift College, Forsyth	Carey T. Vinzant
Brenau College, Gainesville	Josiah Crudup
Clark College, Atlanta	James P. Brawley
Emory University, Emory University	Goodrich C. White
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta	Blake R. Van Leer
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville	Henry King Stanford
LaGrange College, LaGrange	Waights G. Henry, Jr.
Mercer University, Macon	George B. Connell
Morehouse College, Atlanta	Benjamin E. Mays
Morris Brown College, Atlanta	John H. Lewis
Oglethorpe University, Oglethorpe University	George C. Seward, <i>Acting</i>
Paine College, Augusta	E. C. Peters
Piedmont College, Demorest	James E. Walter
Shorter College, Rome	George A. Christenberry
Spelman College, Atlanta	Albert E. Manley
University of Georgia, Athens	Omer C. Aderhold
Valdosta State College, Valdosta	J. Ralph Thaxton
Wesleyan College, Macon	B. Joseph Martin

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu	Paul S. Bachman
--------------------------------------	-----------------

IDAHO

College of Idaho, Caldwell	Tom E. Shearer
Idaho State College, Pocatello	Carl W. McIntosh
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa	John E. Riley
Ricks College, Rexburg	John L. Clarke

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island	Conrad Bergendoff
Aurora College, Aurora	Theodore Pierson Stephens
Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest	Mother Margaret Burke
Blackburn College, Carlinville	Robert P. Ludlum
Bradley University, Peoria	Harold P. Rodes
Carthage College, Carthage	Harold H. Lentz
College of St. Francis, Joliet	Sister M. Elvira
De Paul University, Chicago	Comerford J. O'Malley
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst	Henry W. Dinkmeyer
Eureka College, Eureka	Ira W. Langston
George Williams College, Chicago	John R. McCurdy
Greenville College, Greenville	Henry J. Long
Illinois College, Jacksonville	L. Vernon Caine
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago	J. T. Rettaliata
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington	Merrill J. Holmes
Knox College, Galesburg	Sharvey G. Umbeck
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest	Ernest A. Johnson
Loyola University, Chicago	James F. Maguire

MacMurray College, Jacksonville	Louis W. Norris
Maryknoll Seminary, Glen Ellyn	William P. North
McKendree College, Lebanon	Russell Grow
Millikin University, Decatur	J. Walter Malone
Monmouth College, Monmouth	Robert W. Gibson
Mundelein College, Chicago	Sister Mary John Michael
North Central College, Naperville	C. Harve Geiger
Northwestern University, Evanston	James Roscoe Miller
Quincy College, Quincy	Julian Woods
Rockford College, Rockford	Leland H. Carlson
Roosevelt University, Chicago	Edward J. Sparling
Rosary College, River Forest	Sister Mary Timothea
St. Francis Xavier College for Women, Chicago	Sister Mary Huberta
Shurtleff College, Alton	Roland E. Turnbull
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	D. W. Morris
The Principia, Elmhurst	William E. Morgan
University of Chicago, Chicago	Lawrence A. Kimpton
University of Illinois, Urbana	David D. Henry
Wheaton College, Wheaton	V. R. Edman

INDIANA

Anderson College, Anderson	John A. Morrison
Butler University, Indianapolis	M. O. Ross
DePauw University, Greencastle	Russell J. Humbert
Earlham College, Richmond	Thomas E. Jones
Evansville College, Evansville	Melvin W. Hyde
Franklin College, Franklin	Harold W. Richardson
Goshen College, Goshen	Paul E. Mininger
Hanover College, Hanover	Albert G. Parker, Jr.
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis	I. Lynd Each
Indiana University, Bloomington	Herman B. Wells
Manchester College, North Manchester	V. F. Schwalm
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute	Ford L. Wilkinson, Jr.
St. Joseph's College, Collegeville	Raphael H. Gross
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods	Sister Francis Joseph
St. Mary's College, Notre Dame	Sister M. Madeleva
Taylor University, Upland	Evan H. Bergwall
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame	Theodore M. Hesburgh
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso	O. P. Kretsmann
Wabash College, Crawfordsville	Byron K. Trippet

IOWA

Briar Cliff College, Sioux City	Sister Jean Marie
Buena Vista College, Storm Lake	John A. Fisher
Central College, Pella	G. T. Vander Lugt
Clarke College, Dubuque	Sister Mary Anne Leone

Coe College, Cedar Rapids	Howell H. Brooks
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon	Russell D. Cole
Drake University, Des Moines	Henry Gadd Harmon
Grinnell College, Grinnell	Howard R. Bowen
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant	J. Raymond Chadwick
Loras College, Dubuque	Loras T. Lane
Luther College, Decorah	J. Wilhelm Ylvisaker
Marycrest College, Davenport	Mother Mary Geraldine
Morningside College, Sioux City	Earl A. Roadman
Parsons College, Fairfield	Millard G. Roberts
St. Ambrose College, Davenport	William J. Collins
Simpson College, Indianola	William E. Kerstetter
State University of Iowa, Iowa City	Virgil M. Hancher
University of Dubuque, Dubuque	Gaylord Couchman
Upper Iowa University, Fayette	Eugene E. Garbee
Wartburg College, Waverly	C. H. Becker
Westmar College, Le Mars	D. O. Kime
William Penn College, Oskaloosa	Charles S. Ball

KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin	Nelson P. Horn
Bethany College, Lindsborg	Robert Mortvedt
Bethel College, North Newton	D. C. Wedel
College of Emporia, Emporia	Luther E. Sharpe
Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays	M. C. Cunningham
Friends University, Wichita	Lloyd S. Cressman
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina	D. Arthur Zook
Marymount College, Salina	Mother Mary Helena
McPherson College, McPherson	D. W. Bittinger
Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison	Mother M. Alfred Schroll
Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita	Harry F. Corbin
Ottawa University, Ottawa	Andrew B. Martin
St. Benedict's College, Atchison	Cuthbert McDonald
St. Mary College, Xavier	A. M. Murphy
Southwestern College, Winfield	C. Orville Strohl
Sterling College, Sterling	William M. McCreery
University of Kansas, Lawrence	Franklin Murphy
Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka	Bryan S. Stoffer

KENTUCKY

Asbury College, Wilmore	Z. T. Johnson
Berea College, Berea	Francis Stephenson Hutchins
Centre College, Danville	Walter A. Groves
Georgetown College, Georgetown	Leo Elderman
Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro	Oscar W. Lever
Nazareth College, Louisville	Sister Margaret Gertrude Murphy
Transylvania College, Lexington	Frank A. Rose

Union College, Barboursville	Conway Boatman
University of Kentucky, Lexington	Herman Lee Donovan
University of Louisville, Louisville	Philip G. Davidson
Ursuline College, Louisville	Mother M. Columba

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport	Joe J. Mickle
Dillard University, New Orleans	Albert W. Dent
Louisiana College, Pineville	G. Earl Guinn
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston	R. L. Ropp, <i>Acting</i>
Louisiana State University, University	Troy H. Middleton
Loyola University, New Orleans	W. Patrick Donnelly
McNeese State College, Lake Charles	Lether E. Frazar
Newcomb College, New Orleans	John R. Hubbard, <i>Dean</i>
Northwestern State College, Natchitoches	John S. Kysar
Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans	Thomas U. Bolduc
St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans	Sister Mary Louise
Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond	L. H. Dyson
Southern University, Baton Rouge	F. G. Clark
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette	Joel L. Fletcher
Tulane University, New Orleans	Rufus C. Harris
Xavier University, New Orleans	Sister M. Josephina

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston	Charles F. Phillips
Bowdoin College, Brunswick	James S. Coles
Colby College, Waterville	Julius Seelye Bixler
College of Our Lady of Mercy, Portland	Daniel J. O'Neill
University of Maine, Orono	Arthur A. Hauck

MARYLAND

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore	Sister Margaret Mary
Goucher College, Baltimore	Otto F. Kraushaar
Hood College, Frederick	Andrew G. Truxal
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore	Lowell J. Reed
Loyola College, Baltimore	Vincent F. Beatty
Morgan State College, Baltimore	Martin D. Jenkins
Mount St. Agnes College, Baltimore	Sister Mary Cleophas Costello
Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg	J. L. Sheridan
St. John's College, Annapolis	Richard D. Weigle
St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg	Sister Hilda
United States Naval Academy, Annapolis	Walter F. Boone
University of Maryland, College Park	Wilson H. Elkins
Washington College, Chestertown	Daniel Z. Gibson
Western Maryland College, Westminster	Lowell S. Ensor
Woodstock College, Woodstock	Joseph F. Murphy

MASSACHUSETTS

American International College, Springfield	John Fore Hines
Amherst College, Amherst	Charles W. Cole
Anna Maria College, Paxton	Sister Irene Marie
Assumption College, Worcester	Armand H. Desautels
Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster	Lawrence M. Stump
Boston College, Chestnut Hill	Joseph R. N. Maxwell
Boston University, Boston	Harold C. Case
Brandeis University, Waltham	Abram L. Sachar
Clark University, Worcester	Howard B. Jefferson
College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee	Christopher J. Weldon
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester	William A. Donaghy
Eastern Nazarene College, Wollaston	Edward S. Mann
Emerson College, Boston	S. Justus McKinley
Emmanuel College, Boston	Sister Alice Gertrude
Harvard University, Cambridge	Nathan M. Pusey
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge	James R. Killian, Jr.
Merrimack College, Andover	Vincent A. McQuade
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley	Roswell G. Ham
Newton College of the Sacred Heart, Newton	Mother Eleanor S. Kenny
Northeastern University, Boston	Carl S. Ell
Regis College, Weston	Sister Mary Alice
Simmons College, Boston	William E. Park
Smith College, Northampton	Benjamin F. Wright
Springfield College, Springfield	Donald C. Stone
Tufts College, Tufts College	Nils Y. Wessell
Wellesley College, Wellesley	Margaret Clapp
Wheaton College, Norton	A. Howard Meneely
Williams College, Williamstown	James P. Baxter, III
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester	Arthur Bronwell

MICHIGAN

Adrian College, Adrian	John H. Dawson
Albion College, Albion	William W. Whitehouse
Alma College, Alma	John S. Harker
Aquinas College, Grand Rapids	Arthur F. Bukowski
Calvin College, Grand Rapids	William Spoelhof
Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs	Floyd O. Rittenhouse
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale	J. Donald Phillips
Hope College, Holland	Irwin J. Lubbers
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo	Weimer K. Hicks
Marygrove College, Detroit	Sister M. Honora
Mercy College, Detroit	Sister M. Lucille
Michigan State University, East Lansing	John A. Hannah
Nazareth College, Nazareth	Sister Marie Kathleen
Olivet College, Olivet	Raymond B. Blakney
Siena Heights College, Adrian	Mother M. Gerald

University of Detroit, Detroit	Celestin J. Steiner
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	Harlan H. Hatcher
Wayne University, Detroit	Clarence B. Hilberry

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis	Bernhard Christensen
Carleton College, Northfield	Laurence M. Gould
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph	Mother Richarda Peters
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul	Sister Mary William Brady
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth	Mother M. Athanasius Braegelman
College of St. Teresa, Winona	Sister M. Camille Bowe
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul	Vincent J. Flynn
Concordia College, Moorhead	Joseph L. Knutson
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter	Edgar M. Carlson
Hamline University, St. Paul	Paul H. Giddens
Macalester College, St. Paul	Charles J. Turek
St. John's University, Collegeville	Baldwin Dworschak
St. Mary's College, Winona	Brother J. Ambrose
St. Olaf College, Northfield	Clemens M. Granakou
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis	J. L. Morrill

MISSISSIPPI

Belhaven College, Jackson	McFerran Crowe
Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain	Lawrence T. Lowrey
Jackson College, Jackson	Jacob L. Reddix
Millsaps College, Jackson	H. Ellis Finger, Jr.
Mississippi College, Clinton	D. M. Nelson
Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg	R. A. McLemore, Acting
Mississippi State College, State College	Ben Hilbun
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus	Charles P. Hogarth
University of Mississippi, University	John Davis Williams

MISSOURI

Central College, Fayette	Ralph L. Woodward
College of St. Teresa, Kansas City	Sister M. Berenice O'Neill
Culver-Stockton College, Canton	Leslie E. Ziegler
Drury College, Springfield	James Franklin Findlay
Fontbonne College, St. Louis	Sister Susanne Marie Vachon
Lindenwood College, St. Charles	Franc L. McCluer
Maryville College, St. Louis	Mother Marie Odéide Mouton
Missouri Valley College, Marshall	M. Earle Collins
Park College, Parkville	Robert E. Long
Rockhurst College, Kansas City	Maurice E. Van Ackeren
St. Louis University, St. Louis	Paul C. Reinert
Tarkio College, Tarkio	Clyde H. Canfield
University of Kansas City, Kansas City	Earl J. McGrath
University of Missouri, Columbia	Elmer Ellis

Washington University, St. Louis	Ethan A. H. Shepley
Webster College, Webster Groves	Sister Mariella Collins
Westminster College, Fulton	Robert L. D. Davidson
William Jewell College, Liberty	Walter Pope Binns

MONTANA

Carroll College, Helena	R. Vincent Kavanagh
College of Great Falls, Great Falls	J. J. Donovan
Rocky Mountain College, Billings	Herbert W. Hines

NEBRASKA

Creighton University, Omaha	Carl M. Reinert
Doane College, Crete	Donald M. Typer
Duchesne College, Omaha	Mother Jeanette Kimball
Hastings College, Hastings	Dale D. Welch
Midland College, Fremont	Paul W. Dieckman
Union College, Lincoln	Harvey C. Hartman
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln	A. Leland Forrest
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	Clifford M. Hardin
University of Omaha, Omaha	P. Milo Bail

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover	John S. Dickey
Mount St. Mary College, Hooksett	Sister M. Mauritia
Rivier College, Nashua	Sister Marie Carmella
St. Anselm's College, Manchester	Bertrand C. Dolan
University of New Hampshire, Durham	Eldon L. Johnson

NEW JERSEY

Caldwell College, Caldwell	Mother M. Joseph
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station	Sister Hildegard Marie
Douglass College (founded as New Jersey College for Women), Rutgers University, New Brunswick	Margaret T. Corwin, <i>Dean</i>
Drew University, Madison	Fred G. Holloway
Fairleigh Dickinson College, Rutherford	Peter Sammartino
Georgian Court College, Lakewood	Mother Marie Anna
Newark College of Engineering, Newark	Robert W. Van Houten
Princeton University, Princeton	Harold W. Dodds
Rider College, Trenton	Franklin F. Moore
Rutgers University, New Brunswick	Lewis Webster Jones
St. Peter's College, Jersey City	James J. Shanahan
Seton Hall University, South Orange	John L. McNulty
Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken	Jess H. Davis
Upsala College, East Orange	Evald B. Lawson

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque	Thomas L. Popejoy
---	-------------------

NEW YORK

Adelphi College, Garden City	Paul D. Eddy
Alfred University, Alfred	M. Ellis Drake
Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson	James H. Case, Jr.
Barnard College, Columbia University, New York	Millicent Carey McIntosh
Bellarmino College, Plattsburg	John J. McMahon
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn	Harry David Gideonse
Canisius College, Buffalo	Philip E. Dobson
City College of the City of New York, New York	Buell G. Gallagher
Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam	William G. Van Note
Colgate University, Hamilton	Everett Needham Case
College of Mount St. Vincent, New York	Sister Catharine Marie, <i>Dean</i>
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle	Mother M. Dorothea Dunkerley
College of St. Rose, Albany	Sister Catherine Francis
Columbia University, New York	Grayson L. Kirk
Cornell University Ithaca	Deane W. Malott
D'Youville College, Buffalo	Sister Regina Marie
Elmira College, Elmira	John Ralph Murray
Fordham University, New York	Laurence J. McGinley
Free Europe University in Exile, New York (Strasbourg, France)	
	Levering Tyson
Good Counsel College, White Plains	Sister Mary Dolores
Hamilton College, Clinton	Robert W. McEwen
Hartwick College, Oneonta	M. A. F. Ritchie
Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva	H. Newton Hubbs, <i>Acting</i>
Hofstra College, Hempstead	Jack T. Johnson, <i>Acting</i>
Houghton College, Houghton	Stephen W. Paine
Hunter College of the City of New York, New York	George N. Shuster
Iona College, New Rochelle	William H. Barnes
Ithaca College, Ithaca	Leonard B. Job
Keuka College, Keuka Park	Katherine G. Blyley
Le Moyne College, Syracuse	Robert F. Grewen
Manhattan College, New York	Brother Augustine Philip
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase	
	Mother Eleanor M. O'Byrne
Marymount College, Tarrytown	Mother M. Gerard
Nazareth College, Rochester	Mother M. Helene
New York University, New York	Henry Townley Heald
Niagara University, Niagara Falls	Francis L. Meade
Notre Dame College of Staten Island, Grymes Hill	
	Mother Saint Egbert, <i>Dean</i>
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn	Harry S. Rogers
Pratt Institute, Brooklyn	Francis H. Horn
Queens College of the City of New York, Flushing	John J. Theobald
Russell Sage College, Troy	Lewis A. Froman
St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure	Brian Lhota
St. Francis College, Brooklyn	Brother Jerome

St. John's University, Brooklyn	John A. Flynn
St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn	William T. Dillon
St. Lawrence University, Canton	Eugene G. Bewkes
Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville	Harold Taylor
School of General Studies, Columbia University, New York	
	Louis M. Hacker, <i>Dean</i>
Siena College, Loudonville	Edmund Christy
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs	Henry T. Moore
State University of New York, Albany	William S. Carlson
Syracuse University, Syracuse	William P. Tolley
Union College, Schenectady	Carter Davidson
United States Military Academy, West Point	Frederick A. Irving
University of Buffalo, Buffalo	Clifford C. Furnas
University of Rochester, Rochester	C. W. deKiewiet
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie	Sarah G. Blanding
Wagner College, Staten Island	David M. Delo
Wells College, Aurora	Louis J. Long
Yeshiva University, New York	Samuel Belkin

NORTH CAROLINA

Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro	F. D. Bluford
Atlantic Christian College, Wilson	Travis White
Bennett College, Greensboro	Willia B. Player
Catawba College, Salisbury	Alvin Robert Keppel
Davidson College, Davidson	John R. Cunningham
Duke University, Durham	A. Hollis Edens
East Carolina College, Greenville	John D. Messick
Elon College, Elon College	L. E. Smith
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs	Marshall S. Woodson
Greensboro College, Greensboro	Harold H. Hutson
Guilford College, Guilford	Clyde A. Milner
High Point College, High Point	Dennis H. Cooke
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte	Hardy Liston
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory	Voigt B. Cromer
Livingstone College, Salisbury	W. J. Trent
Meredith College, Raleigh	Carlyle Campbell
North Carolina College at Durham, Durham	Alfonso Elder
Pembroke State College, Pembroke	R. D. Wellons
Queens College, Charlotte	Edwin R. Walker
St. Augustine's College, Raleigh	James A. Boyer
Salem College, Winston-Salem	Dale H. Gramley
Shaw University, Raleigh	William R. Strassner
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	J. Harris Purks, <i>Acting</i>
Wake Forest College, Wake Forest	Harold W. Tribble
Woman's College, University of North Carolina, Greensboro	
	Edward K. Graham

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown	Edwin M. Rian
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks	George W. Starcher

OHIO

Antioch College, Yellow Springs	Samuel B. Gould
Ashland College, Ashland	Glenn L. Clayton
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea	A. B. Bonds, Jr.
Bluffton College, Bluffton	Lloyd L. Ramseyer
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green	Ralph W. McDonald
Capital University, Columbus	Harold L. Yochum
Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland	T. Keith Glennan
Central State College, Wilberforce	Charles H. Wesley
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph	Sister Maria Corona, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Mary of the Springs, Columbus	Sister M. Angelita
College of Wooster, Wooster	Howard F. Lowry
Defiance College, Defiance	Kevin McCann
Denison University, Granville	A. Blair Knapp
Fenn College, Cleveland	G. Brooks Earnest
Findlay College, Findlay	W. Clifford Fox
Heidelberg College, Tiffin	W. Terry Wickham
Hiram College, Hiram	Paul H. Fall
John Carroll University, Cleveland	F. E. Welfle
Kent State University, Kent	George A. Bowman
Kenyon College, Gambier	Gordon Keith Chalmers
Lake Erie College, Painesville	Paul Weaver
Marietta College, Marietta	W. Bay Irvine
Mary Manse College, Toledo	Sister John Baptist Macelwane
Miami University, Oxford	John D. Millett
Mount Union College, Alliance	Carl C. Braey
Muskingum College, New Concord	Robert N. Montgomery
Notre Dame College, South Euclid	Sister Mary Ralph
Oberlin College, Oberlin	William E. Stevenson
Ohio Northern University, Ada	F. B. McIntosh
Ohio State University, Columbus	H. L. Bevis
Ohio University, Athens	John C. Baker
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware	Clarence E. Ficken, <i>Acting</i>
Otterbein College, Westerville	J. Gordon Howard
Our Lady of Cincinnati College, Cincinnati	Sister Mary Grace Grace
University of Akron, Akron	Norman P. Auburn
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati	Walter C. Langsam
University of Dayton, Dayton	Andrew L. Seebold
University of Toledo, Toledo	Asa S. Knowles
Ursuline College, Cleveland	Mother Marie
Western College, Oxford	Herriek B. Young
Western Reserve University, Cleveland	John S. Millis
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce	Charles L. Hill

Wilmington College, Wilmington	Samuel D. Marble
Wittenberg College, Springfield	Clarence C. Stoughton
Xavier University, Cincinnati	Paul L. O'Connor
Youngstown University, Youngstown	Howard W. Jones

OKLAHOMA

Bethany-Peniel College, Bethany	Roy H. Cantrell
Langston University, Langston	G. L. Harrison
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater	Oliver S. Willham
Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee	John W. Raley
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City	C. Q. Smith
Phillips University, Enid	Eugene S. Briggs
University of Oklahoma, Norman	George L. Cross
University of Tulsa, Tulsa	C. I. Pontius

OREGON

Lewis and Clark College, Portland	Morgan S. Odell
Linfield College, McMinnville	Harry L. Dillin
Marylhurst College, Marylhurst	Sister M. Elizabeth Clare
Pacific University, Forest Grove	Charles J. Armstrong
Reed College, Portland	Frank L. Griffin
University of Oregon, Eugene	O. Meredith Wilson
University of Portland, Portland	Howard J. Kenna
Willamette University, Salem	G. Herbert Smith

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Reading	Harry V. Masters
Allegheny College, Meadville	Lawrence L. Pelletier
Alliance College, Cambridge Springs	Arthur P. Coleman
Beaver College, Jenkintown	Raymond M. Kistler
Bucknell University, Lewisburg	Merle M. Odgers
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh	J. C. Warner
Cedar Crest College, Allentown	Dale H. Moore
Chatham College, Pittsburgh	Paul R. Anderson
Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia	Sister Catharine Frances
College Misericordia, Dallas	Sister M. Gonzaga
Dickinson College, Carlisle	William W. Edel
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia	James Creese
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh	Vernon F. Gallagher
Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids	Gilbert L. Guffin
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown	A. C. Baugher
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster	William W. Hall
Geneva College, Beaver Falls	Charles M. Lee
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg	John S. Rice, <i>Acting</i>
Grove City College, Grove City	Weir C. Kotler
Haverford College, Haverford	Archibald MacIntosh, <i>Acting</i>
Immaculata College, Immaculata	Sister Mary of Lourdes

Juniata College, Huntingdon	Calvert N. Ellis
Lafayette College, Easton	Ralph C. Hutchison
LaSalle College, Philadelphia	Brother E. Stanislaus
Lebanon Valley College, Annville	Frederic K. Miller
Lehigh University, Bethlehem	Martin D. Whitaker
Lincoln University, Lincoln University	Horace M. Bond
Lycoming College, Williamsport	D. Frederick Wertz
Marywood College, Scranton	Sister M. Eugenia
Mercyhurst College, Erie	Mother M. Eustace Taylor
Moravian College, Bethlehem	Raymond S. Hauptert
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh	Mother M. Muriel
Muhlenberg College, Allentown	J. Conrad Seegers
Pennsylvania Military College, Chester	E. E. MacMorland
Pennsylvania State University, University Park	Milton S. Eisenhower
Rosemont College, Rosemont	Mother Mary Chrysostom
St. Francis College, Loretto	Xavier Crowley
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia	Edward G. Jacklin
St. Vincent College, Latrobe	Denis O. Strittmatter
Seton Hill College, Greensburg	William G. Ryan
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove	G. Morris Smith
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore	Courtney C. Smith
Temple University, Philadelphia	Robert L. Johnson
Thiel College, Greenville	Fredrie B. Irvin
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia	Gaylord P. Harnwell
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh	Edward H. Litchfield
University of Scranton, Scranton	John J. Long
Ursinus College, Collegeville	Norman E. McClure
Villa Maria College, Erie	Sister Doloretta
Villanova University, Villanova	James A. Donnellon
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington	Boyd C. Patterson
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg	Paul R. Stewart
Westminster College, New Wilmington	Will W. Orr
Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre	Eugene S. Farley
Wilson College, Chambersburg	Paul Swain Havens

PUERTO RICO

Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce	William J. Ferree
College of the Sacred Heart, Santurce	Mother Rosa Aurora Arsuaga
Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico, San German	Ronald C. Bauer
University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras	Jaime Benitez

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence	Barnaby C. Keeney
Pembroke College, Brown University, Providence	Nancy Duke Lewis, <i>Dean</i>
Providence College, Providence	Robert J. Slavin
Rhode Island School of Design, Providence	John B. Frazier, <i>Acting</i>
University of Rhode Island, Kingston	Carl R. Woodward

SOUTH CAROLINA

Allen University, Columbia	Samuel R. Higgins
Benedict College, Columbia	J. A. Bacoats
Clafin University, Orangeburg	J. J. Seabrook
Coker College, Hartsville	John A. Barry, Jr.
College of Charleston, Charleston	George D. Grice
Columbia College, Columbia	B. Wright Spears
Converse College, Spartanburg	Elford C. Morgan, <i>Acting</i>
Erskine College, Due West	J. Mauldin Lesesne, <i>Acting</i>
Furman University, Greenville	John L. Plyler
Lander College, Greenwood	B. M. Grier
Limestone College, Gaffney	Andrew J. Eastwood
Newberry College, Newberry	C. A. Kaufmann
Presbyterian College, Clinton	Marshall W. Brown
South Carolina State College, Orangeburg	B. C. Turner
The Citadel, Charleston	Mark W. Clark
University of South Carolina, Columbia	Donald Russell
Winthrop College, Rock Hill	Henry R. Sims
Wofford College, Spartanburg	F. Pendleton Gaines

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls	Lawrence M. Stavig
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell	Matthew D. Smith
Huron College, Huron	Daniel E. Kerr
Yankton College, Yankton	Adrian Rondileau

TENNESSEE

Austin Peay State College, Clarksville	Halbert Harvill
Bethel College, McKenzie	Roy N. Baker
Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City	Harley Fite
David Lipscomb College, Nashville	Athens Clay Pullias
Fiak University, Nashville	Charles S. Johnson
King College, Bristol	R. T. L. Liston
Knoxville College, Knoxville	James A. Colston
Lambuth College, Jackson	Luther L. Gobbel
Lane College, Jackson	C. A. Kirkendoll
LeMoyne College, Memphis	Hollis F. Price
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate	Robert L. Kincaid
Maryville College, Maryville	Ralph W. Lloyd
Milligan College, Milligan College	Dean E. Walker
Scarritt College, Nashville	Foye G. Gibson
Southern Missionary College, Collegedale	Kenneth A. Wright
Southwestern, Memphis	Peyton N. Rhodes
Tusculum College, Greeneville	Raymond C. Rankin
Union University, Jackson	Warren F. Jones
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga	David A. Lockmiller
University of the South, Sewanee	Edward McCrady, Jr.

University of Tennessee, Knoxville	C. E. Brehm
Vanderbilt University, Nashville	Harvie Branscomb

TEXAS

Abilene Christian College, Abilene	Don H. Morris
Austin College, Sherman	John B. Moseley
Baylor University, Waco	W. R. White
Bishop College, Marshall	M. K. Curry, Jr.
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene	Evan A. Reiff
Howard Payne College, Brownwood	Guy D. Newman
Incarinate Word College, San Antonio	Sister M. Columkille
Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Belton	Arthur Tyson
McMurry College, Abilene	Harold G. Cooke
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio	John LaSalle McMahon
Rice Institute, Houston	William V. Houston
St. Edward's University, Austin	Elmo Bransby
St. Mary's University, San Antonio	Walter J. Buehler
Southern Methodist University, Dallas	Willis M. Tate
Southwestern University, Georgetown	William C. Finch
Sul Ross State College, Alpine	Bryan Wildenthal
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth	M. E. Sadler
Texas College, Tyler	D. R. Glass
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville	Ernest H. Poteet
Texas Lutheran College, Seguin	Edward A. Sagebiel
Texas Southern University, Houston	Samuel M. Nabritt
Texas State College of Women, Denton	John A. Guinn
Texas Technological College, Lubbock	E. N. Jones
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth	Law Sone
Texas Western College, El Paso	Dysart Edgar Holecomb
Trinity University, San Antonio	James W. Laurie
University of Houston, Houston	A. D. Bruce
University of St. Thomas, Houston	V. J. Guinan
University of Texas, Austin	Logan Wilson
Wiley College, Marshall	J. S. Scott

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo	Ernest L. Wilkinson
University of Utah, Salt Lake City	A. Ray Olpin
Utah State Agricultural College, Logan	Daryl Chase
Westminster College, Salt Lake City	J. Richard Palmer

VERMONT

Bennington College, Bennington	Frederick Burekhardt
Middlebury College, Middlebury	Samuel S. Stratton
Norwich University, Northfield	Ernest N. Harmon
St. Michael's College, Winooski	Francis E. Moriarty
Trinity College, Burlington	Mother M. Emmanuel

VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater	Warren D. Bowman
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg	Alvin Duke Chandler
Emory and Henry College, Emory	Joseph C. Robert
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney	Joseph C. Robert
Hampton Institute, Hampton	Alonzo G. Moron
Hollins College, Hollins College	John R. Everett
Longwood College, Farmville	Francis G. Lankford, Jr.
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg	Orville W. Wake
Madison College, Harrisonburg	G. Tyler Miller
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton	Charles W. McKenzie
Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg	Grellet C. Simpson
Radford College, Radford	Charles K. Martin, Jr.
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland	J. Earl Moreland
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg	William F. Quillian, Jr.
Roanoke College, Salem	H. Sherman Oberly
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar	Anne Gary Pannell
University of Richmond, Richmond	George M. Modlin
University of Virginia, Charlottesville	Colgate W. Darden, Jr.
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington	William H. Milton, Jr.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg	Walter S. Newman
Virginia State College, Petersburg	Robert P. Daniel
Virginia Union University, Richmond	Samuel D. Proctor
Washington and Lee University, Lexington	Francis P. Gaines

WASHINGTON

College of Puget Sound, Tacoma	R. Franklin Thompson
Gonzaga University, Spokane	Francis E. Corkery
Holy Names College, Spokane	Sister Marian Raphael
Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland	S. C. Eastvold
St. Martin's College, Olympia	Raphael Heider
Seattle Pacific College, Seattle	C. Hoyt Watson
Seattle University, Seattle	Albert A. Lemieux
University of Washington, Seattle	Henry Schmitz
Walla Walla College, College Place	P. W. Christian
Whitman College, Walla Walla	Chester C. Maxey
Whitworth College, Spokane	Frank F. Warren

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany	Perry E. Gresham
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins	David K. Allen
Fairmont State College, Fairmont	John W. Pence
Marshall College, Huntington	Stewart H. Smith
Salem College, Salem	K. Duane Hurley
Shepherd College, Shepherdstown	Oliver S. Ikenberry
West Virginia State College, Institute	William J. L. Wallace

West Virginia University, Morgantown Irvin Stewart
 West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon William J. Scarborough

WISCONSIN

Alverno College, Milwaukee Sister M. Augustine
 Beloit College, Beloit Miller Upton
 Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee Mother M. Bartholomew
 Carroll College, Waukesha Robert D. Steele
 Lawrence College, Appleton Douglas M. Knight
 Marquette University, Milwaukee Edward J. O'Donnell
 Milton College, Milton Percy L. Dunn
 Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee John B. Johnson, Jr.
 Mount Mary College, Milwaukee Sister M. John Francis
 Northland College, Ashland Gus Turbeville
 Ripon College, Ripon Fred O. Pinkham
 St. Norbert College, West De Pere Dennis M. Burke
 University of Wisconsin, Madison Mark H. Ingraham, *Dean*
 Viterbo College, La Crosse Sister M. Francesca

WYOMING

University of Wyoming, Laramie G. D. Humphrey

CANADA

Mount Allison University, Sackville, New Brunswick W. T. Ross Flemington
 Victoria University, Toronto, Ontario A. B. B. Moore

EGYPT

American University at Cairo Raymond F. McLain

LEBANON

American University of Beirut C. K. Zurayk, *Acting*

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Centro Escolar University, Manila Concepcion A. Aguila

TURKEY

Robert College, Istanbul Duncan S. Ballantine

HONORARY MEMBERS

American Association for the Advancement of Science
 American Association of University Professors
 American Association of University Women
 American Council of Learned Societies
 American Council on Education

Carnegie Corporation of New York
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
General Education Board
Institute of International Education
Jesuit Educational Association
National Catholic Educational Association
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.
New York State Department of Higher Education
Social Science Research Council
United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa
United States Office of Education

CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, INCORPORATED

ARTICLE I

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

ARTICLE II

The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges, Incorporated."

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. The membership of the Association shall be composed of those colleges of liberal arts and sciences and universities having colleges of liberal arts and sciences which may be duly elected to membership in the Association after recommendation by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. Honorary Membership. The general secretaries of church boards of education and officials of educational foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

ARTICLE IV

REPRESENTATION

Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the faculty or board of trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of church boards cooperating with such an institution and the representatives of foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

ARTICLE V

FIELD OF OPERATION

SECTION 1. The territory in which the operations of the Association are principally to be conducted is the United States.

ARTICLE VI

OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The Association shall elect from its membership the following:

1. President
2. Vice President
3. Executive Director
4. Treasurer

SECTION 2. The Executive Director shall be the executive officer of the Association and shall serve until his successor is duly elected. The other officers shall serve for one year or until their successors are duly elected. Election of officers shall be by ballot.

SECTION 3. The duties of the respective officers shall be those usually connected with said offices.

ARTICLE VII

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SECTION 1. The Board of Directors shall consist of the officers of the Association during their respective terms of office, the retiring president during the year immediately following his term of office and four other directors elected by ballot by the Association. In the first election of directors after the adoption of this article, one director shall be elected for four years, one for three years, one for two years and one for one year. Thereafter one director shall be elected each year for a term of four years. If any director who is not an officer of the Association be elected an officer before the expiry of his term of four years, the unexpired portion of his term shall be filled by the election of a director to replace him. No director who has served for more than one year shall be eligible for re-election except as an officer of the Association until after the lapse of one year from the expiry of his most recent term of service.

SECTION 2. The President of the Association shall be *ex officio* chairman of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 3. Except as provided by statute and as directed by the members of the Association, and subject to the Constitution and By-Laws, the Board of Directors shall have power to manage, operate and direct the affairs of the Association and fill all vacancies.

ARTICLE VIII

QUORUM

Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE IX

BY-LAWS

The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government, not inconsistent with the provisions hereof and the certificate of incorporation.

ARTICLE X

AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two thirds of the members then present.

BY-LAWS

1. Applications for membership shall be made to the Board of Directors, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.

2. The annual dues shall be one hundred (\$100.00) per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.

3. At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of January of each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Board of Directors, provided that four-weeks' notice in writing be given each institution connected with the Association.

4. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Board of Directors.

5. All expenditure of funds of the Association shall be authorized by resolution of the Association, or subject to later approval by the Association, by the Board of Directors.

6. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.

7. There shall be within the Association a permanent commission to be known as the "Commission on Christian Higher Education." This Commission shall have such autonomy as may be necessary in order to represent the interests of church-related colleges in general and to carry on a program of promoting spiritual values in higher education. The Commission is to operate under rules mutually agreed to by the Commission and the Board of Directors.

8. The Executive Director shall mail three copies of the official BULLETIN to all institutions which are members of the Association. Additional copies, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be had at a special rate.

9. These By-Laws may be amended at any business session of the Association by two thirds vote, provided that notice of the proposed amendment has been presented at a previous session.

POLICY

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than of exclusiveness.*

FORMER PRESIDENTS

- 1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted*
- 1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College
- 1916-17 President Henry Churchill King,* Oberlin College
- 1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College
- President Hill M. Bell,* Drake University, *Vice President, pre-*
siding
- 1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College
- 1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University
- 1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
- 1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain,* Denison University
- 1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond,* Union College
- President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice President, pre-*
siding
- 1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College
- 1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland,* Vanderbilt University
- 1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College
- 1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger,* University of Michigan
- 1927-28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College
- 1928-29 President Trevor Arnett,* General Education Board
- 1929-30 President Guy E. Snavelly, Birmingham-Southern College
- 1930-31 Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University
- 1931-32 President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College
- 1932-33 President Irving Maurer,* Beloit College
- 1933-34 President Edmund D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University
- 1934-35 President William Mather Lewis,* Lafayette College
- 1935-36 President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College
- 1936-37 President James R. McCain, Agnes Scott College
- 1937-38 President James L. McConaughy,* Wesleyan University
- 1938-39 President John L. Seaton, Albion College
- 1939-40 President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College
- 1940-41 President Edward V. Stanford, Villanova College
- 1941-42 President Remsen D. Bird, Occidental College
- 1942-43 President Charles E. Diehl, Southwestern
- 1943-44 Chancellor William P. Tolley, Syracuse University
- 1944-45 President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University
- 1945-46 President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College
- 1946-47 President Charles J. Turck, Macalester College
- 1947-48 President Mildred McAfee Horton, Wellesley College
- 1948-49 President Kenneth I. Brown, Denison University
- 1949-50 President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas
- 1950-51 President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University
- 1951-52 Vice Chancellor LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University
- 1952-53 President M. E. Sadler, Texas Christian University
- 1953-54 President John R. Cunningham, Davidson College
- 1954-55 Chancellor R. H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh
- 1955-56 President Joseph R. N. Maxwell, Boston College

* Deceased.

EDITORIAL NOTES

HAVING NOW BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR ONE WHOLE VOLUME OF THE BULLETIN, your new editor feels entitled to address a personal message to its readers. You may rest assured that he will not do so very often, but he wants you to know that it is a pleasure as well as a privilege for him to serve you.

STARTING WITH THIS ISSUE, we have been obliged to raise our subscription rates—for the first time in 38 years. We were most unwilling to take this step but rising costs left us no choice. The Directors of the Association do not expect the BULLETIN to be wholly self-supporting—some two fifths of our circulation consists of free copies distributed to member colleges—but they believe that income from subscriptions, reprints and advertising should cover a larger fraction of our costs than it has done in the last few years. By way of compensation, we can only promise our unremitting efforts to give you value for money. In that endeavor, a new and inexperienced editor would like to acknowledge with warm gratitude his debt to his colleagues Mrs. Tuma and Miss Kolodziey and not least to the Executive Director, whose paternal guidance is never obtrusive but always available.

FOLLOWING THE EXAMPLE OF OUR DISTINGUISHED PREDECESSORS, we are striving to make the BULLETIN something more than a mere journal of record. We want it to be a working tool for our members in pursuit of the high purposes for which the Association of American Colleges was established. We hope that the BULLETIN will become an increasingly effective vehicle for the discussion of issues important to the welfare of higher education. If you are in the habit of reading the fine print in our opening pages, you will have noticed the disappearance from this issue of a form of words referring to "criticism or controversy." The reason is simply that your Editor believes that criticism is of the essence of higher education and that any issue of more than trivial significance is bound to be controversial, in the sense of giving rise to honest differences

of opinion. So long as our contributors stick to the point and mind their manners, they may express any views they please, whether or not these views are to the taste of the Editor, the Board of Directors or anybody else. Within the framework of that policy we invite your contributions. Without them our poor efforts would be of no avail. As Dr. Distler says of the Association itself in his annual report, the BULLETIN is yours and will be as good as you make it.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CUSTOM, the present issue contains the proceedings of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Association. Unfortunately, without making this issue too bulky, it was impossible for us to include all the addresses and papers delivered at St. Louis. Some will be held over for the May issue. In particular, with the help of President Weigle, Chairman of the Commission on Liberal Education, we hope to publish in May a full account of the sectional meeting on "The Teacher and Himself."

AERICAN OXONIAN, the magazine of the Association of American Rhodes Scholars, has announced the election of its new editor, President E. Wilson Lyon of Pomona College.

THE FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION has published a report entitled "Teachers for Tomorrow" which brings together available facts showing the outlook for school and college enrolments, teacher demand and potential teacher supply over the next 10 to 20 years. "Teaching Salaries Then and Now" by Beardsley Ruml and Sidney Tickton, also published by The Fund, is a 50-year comparison with other occupations and industries. Copies of the latter work may be obtained without charge from The Fund offices, 655 Madison Avenue, New York 21, New York.

UNIVERSITIES AND UNIONS IN WORKERS' EDUCATION by Jack Barbash is a report of an experiment in workers' education conducted cooperatively by eight universities and two labor unions. The report is of particular interest to teachers in social studies, especially in relation to labor problems,

but the subject itself is one which will increasingly interest college presidents as both adult education and education of our labor force grow in importance. Harper & Brothers, New York.

THE FOURTH ANNUAL LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, co-sponsored by the Association of University Evening Colleges, the National University Extension Association and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, will take place 5, 6 and 7 March to consider the responsibilities of the dean or director in university adult education and to determine the major obstacles which must be surmounted to enable him to function more effectively.

THE COLLEGE AND STUDENT HEALTH by Ethel L. Ginsburg was published as a result of the Fourth National Conference on Health in Colleges, held in New York City in May 1954. The program for college health services presented in this volume is based on the assumption that student health is an integral part of higher education and that raising health standards in college will make possible the elevation of intellectual standards. Written primarily for college and university administrators, this work should also be of interest to alumni groups, student organizations and other bodies interested in raising the physical and mental standards of American youth. Published by National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, New York.

A COMPARATIVE EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM has been planned for professional educators who have a responsibility for teaching courses that treat of education in European countries. An advisory committee of 12, which includes Bess Goodykoontz, Deputy Director of the Division of International Education, U. S. Office of Education and Dr. William Brickman of New York University, has been selected to assist in the planning of the project. A tour of Europe is planned for 18 August to 17 September 1956 at a cost of \$775. Arrangements will be made for each person with special interests to meet with European educators and teachers of similar interests. Application blanks and additional information may be obtained by writing

to Mr. Gerald Read, Committee Secretary, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS AND LOANS, Volume III by S. Norman Feingold contains complete information on 8,000 scholarships, fellowships, loans and grants-in-aid carrying awards of more than \$10,000,000 a year. Volume III stresses examples of financial assistance that may be available at the local level. An attempt has been made to locate student aid for goals not included in the first two volumes. The material is indexed and cross-referenced to facilitate the location of particular material. Bellman Publishing Company, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts, Volume III, \$10. All three volumes, \$20.00.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE COLLEGE STUDENT of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry is seeking information on any project concerned with fostering the emotional growth of total student populations. This material is needed in preparation for a projected international conference on college mental health to be held in the U. S. A. in the fall of 1956. Information should be sent to the Chairman, 677 Lafayette Street, Denver, Colorado.

IF WE ARE SEEKING BETTER UNDERSTANDING of other nations, we might do worse than start with Canada. For close and exceptionally friendly neighbors, Americans and Canadians seem surprisingly ignorant of each other's ways and institutions. Similarities are taken for granted and when differences crop up they are unduly disconcerting. A handy and amusing corrective for ignorance on this side of the undefended frontier is offered by "Are Canadians Really?" published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.—single copies 50¢, 11 to 100 copies 35¢ each, 101 to 1000 copies 20¢ each and so on up, with a further discount of 25% on quantities of 100 or more purchased by schools and colleges.

THE RESTORATION OF LEARNING*

(Book Review)

WILLIAM K. SELDEN

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

THIS book was written by an able historian who has been honored by his present appointment as Harmsworth Professor of American History at Oxford. Professor Arthur Bestor, regularly of the University of Illinois, presents a long, documented account of the state of education in our public schools. Not merely is he dissatisfied with the results; he is bitterly critical, even vindictive towards those whom he holds largely responsible for these conditions. His approach reminds one less of the historian and more of the pamphleteer.

Yet Bestor makes many sound observations. He writes that: "The school exists to serve the needs of men and women. Like the hospital and the post office, however, it is not designed to provide all kinds of services indiscriminately. There is one particular need that schools—and only schools—are peculiarly adapted to satisfy. That is the need for intellectual training." He considers the schools to have failed in this, their main task. In presenting such points, he caustically criticizes those who have carried the burden of administering the public schools and those who have had the major responsibility of conducting programs in teacher education. His criticisms and suggestions show a lack of conception of the many forces involved.

This book will not encourage understanding on the part of the college professor or president whose association with the public schools ended on his graduation from high school. It will tend rather to reaffirm what prejudices he may have developed from observing students whom he considers to be ill prepared for college. If such a professor or president does read this stimulating book he will do well to ponder an equally appropriate criticism: "The heart of the problem is the schism that exists in institutions of higher learning between the professors of pedagogy (or to use

* *The Restoration of Learning* by Arthur Bestor. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1954. 459 pp. \$6.00.

the misleading title they prefer, professors of education) and all the other faculties, both liberal and professional. For this situation scholars themselves are partly to blame. As their responsibilities within their own fields have grown greater . . . they have tended to turn their backs upon the problems of elementary and secondary education. . . . They are reaping today the whirlwind which their indifference and acquiescence have helped to sow."

Bestor has done a service in writing this book but the service would have been greater if he had written in an historian's frame of mind.

AMONG THE COLLEGES

AMHERST COLLEGE has received from Charles E. Merrill, directing partner of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, a gift of \$300,000 to provide housing at modest cost for younger members of the faculty.

BETHANY COLLEGE (W. Va.) has announced a new lectureship on Alexander Campbell provided by a \$25,000 grant from the Oreon E. Scott Foundation of St. Louis. A new \$400,000 dormitory will be dedicated on 3 April in memory of Campbell who founded the College in 1840.

CARLETON COLLEGE has announced that \$4,863,200 has been contributed to the College during the past ten years. This is an increase of 99% over contributions in the previous decade.

CHATHAM COLLEGE has received from Radio Station KDKA in Pittsburgh a musical arrangements collection valued at \$50,000 which is one of the largest of its kind in the United States. The College has inaugurated a \$12,000,000 development program extending to 1969.

DOANE COLLEGE has announced a gain of \$372,200 in endowment investments during the past fiscal year derived quite largely from the estate of the late Senator Hugh Butler and the estate of Joseph Sedlacek. When the grant from the Ford Foundation to Doane College is added to its present endowment it will equal \$2,194,000 an all-time high for Nebraska liberal arts colleges.

HEIDELBERG COLLEGE has received a gift of \$500,000 from Mrs. Sarah D. Kreig of Canton, Ohio.

IMMACULATA COLLEGE dedicated three new buildings on 1 November: Good Counsel Hall, a structure with classrooms, libraries and cafeteria; Marian Hall, a residence for students; and Gillet Hall, a residence for nuns.

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE received a total of \$1,350,450 in gifts during the year ending 30 June 1955, including \$170,-

700 for current educational operations, \$109,250 for plant expansion and \$1,070,500 for permanent endowment.

LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE has announced that a new dormitory housing 250 students, financed by a \$1,000,000 government loan, will be ready for occupancy in September 1957.

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY held ceremonies on 30 November in connection with the laying of the cornerstone of the University's \$1,550,000 classroom-laboratory building.

NORTHLAND COLLEGE has received a gift of \$35,000 from George M. Mead of Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin to be applied toward the construction of a new men's dormitory. The College is also the beneficiary of \$18,725 from the estate of Gracia M. F. Barnhart.

POMONA COLLEGE received a total of \$923,800 in gifts during the fiscal year 1954-55.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY has announced a long-range development program for teachers' salaries, student aid, campus development and educational environment totaling \$41,600,000.

UNIVERSITY OF OMAHA is the recipient of a gift of \$850,000 from the Eugene C. Eppley Foundation to cover the cost of the Gene Eppley Library now nearing completion.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO has completed a new dormitory for men constructed at a cost of \$1,500,000.

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO is the recipient of a gift of \$50,000 from Mr. and Mrs. Ward M. Canaday of Toledo to establish a department of nuclear engineering.

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING has received an additional \$1,800,000 from the estate of the late William Robertson Coe; \$1,000,000 of the bequest will be used to supplement the \$750,000 made available by the legislature to construct a new library and the William Robertson Coe School of American Stud-

ies building. The remainder of the bequest, about \$750,000, will be used for further endowment of the American Studies program for which Mr. Coe gave approximately \$1,000,000 before his death. The additional funds for endowment will enable the University to broaden and expand the American Studies program by providing for additional scholarships and employing additional professors, as well as offering a Doctor of Philosophy degree in American Studies.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY dedicated on 5 February the I. F. Freiburger Library Building which was constructed at a cost of \$1,600,000.

WHITWORTH COLLEGE is presently completing work on the W. H. Cowles Memorial Auditorium being constructed at a cost of \$450,000 with a gift from the Cowles Foundation of Spokane. Work has also begun on a new classroom building, the 18th building constructed during the administration of President Frank F. Warren.

NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Bennett College, Greensboro, North Carolina. Willa B. Player.

Coker College, Hartsville, South Carolina. John A. Barry, Jr.

College of Notre Dame, Belmont, California. Sister Teresa Augustine.

Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Virginia. Joseph C. Robert.

Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois. L. Vernon Caine.

Manchester College, North Manchester, Indiana. A. Blair Helman.

Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, California. Mother Rosemary Lyons.

St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa. William J. Collins.

Shurtleff College, Alton, Illinois. Roland E. Turnbull.

Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana. Byron K. Trippet.

Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana. Sister M. Josephina.

the figures are in!
.....

**23 RECENT COLLEGE
FUND-RAISING CAMPAIGNS
OVERSUBSCRIBED BY
ALMOST \$4,000,000!**

Total Goal:

\$33,270,000

Total Raised:

\$37,065,000

Oversubscribed:

\$3,795,000

If you are faced with a college fund-raising problem, we will be happy to consult with you without cost or obligation. We also urge you to write for our College Folders, and a new booklet commemorating our 50th Anniversary in organized fund-raising.

WARD DRESHMAN & REINHARDT

30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N.Y.—Tel.: CIRCLE 6-1560

*Charter and founding member of The American Association
of Fund-Raising Counsel.*

"WHICH OF THESE BALFOUR SERVICES FITS YOUR NEEDS"

INSIGNIA REQUIREMENTS

College rings—Badges—Keys
Fraternity Insignia—Service
Awards

AWARDS FOR ACHIEVE- MENT

Medals—Cups—Trophies—
Plaques—Scholarship awards to
stimulate effort.

SYMBOLS OF OFFICE—

Custom

made to order in 10K gold, set
with diamonds and precious
jewels, the College President's
Jewel of Office is a beautiful
symbol of the jeweler's craft and
is worn at official functions.

PAPER PRODUCTS

(Engraved)

Distinctive engraved stationery—
Invitations
Christmas Cards
Dance Programs
College Diplomas
Announcements
Banquet menus and Place Cards
Membership certificates and Cards

SCROLLS AND CITATIONS

To honor service and achievement.
Hand engrossed and illuminated
in color.

"Write us regarding your requirements"

Official jeweler to Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Tau Beta Pi
and other leading honorary and social
fraternities and sororities

L. G.

Main Factories

BALFOUR

COMPANY

Attleboro, Massachusetts

MARTS & LUNDY, INCORPORATED

521 Fifth Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

•

Public relations and
fund-raising counselors

•

For colleges and other philanthropic
institutions.

Charter Member of The American Association
of Fund-Raising Counsel

Designed for College Use

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN CHRISTIANITY *since 1500*

by **FREDERICK A. NORWOOD, Ph.D.**, associate professor of church history, Garrett Biblical Institute

A succinct account of the rise of denominations in their historical context, from A.D. 1500 to the present time. Dr. Norwood does not attempt to trace the growth of any denomination in detail, but instead deals with the great men and ideas that originated each group. For the serious student of church history he has added supplemental maps, charts, a thorough index, and suggestions for additional reading. **\$3.75**

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF JESUS

by **CHARLES M. LAYMON, Th.D.**, editor of adult publications. Board of Education, the Methodist Church

A thorough study of the many aspects of Jesus' life, ministry, and teachings—a fully developed, wholly objective outline for classroom work. Written with the teacher and his task specifically in mind, this book meets an expressed need as defined by college teachers themselves. Varied points of view are given when there are significant differences of opinion among scholars. Among the desirable classroom features: short chapters, simple style, questions at end of each chapter, complete indexes. **\$3**

For complete information on these and other books, write College Department, Abingdon Press, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee.

At All Bookstores

ABINGDON PRESS

THIS WORLD AND THE CHURCH

by **HOWARD HONG** *Chairman, Dept. of Philosophy, St. Olaf College*

A study of secularism, encompassing a complete rethinking of the Church's attitude toward the world. Dr. Hong is a vigorous proponent of the Church's becoming more active in its relationship with the world in order to combat the gradual erosion of faith caused by secularized thought and life.

Dr. Hong brings a sound, scholarly, philosophical approach to intellectual and moral problems.

This study was originally delivered as lectures at the 1952 Mid-Winter Convocation, Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, and awarded the 1952 Augsburg Publishing House Lectureship Award.

\$2.50

AUGSBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE

Minneapolis 15, Minn.

**The Dead Sea
Scrolls throw
new light on the
books in . . .**

volume 5

THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE

Volume 5 contains the introductory articles, texts, and complete commentaries on **Ecclesiastes, The Song of Songs, Isaiah and Jeremiah**. Results of study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, discovered in 1947 and highly illuminating to our understanding of these books, have been incorporated in the commentary. **\$8.75**

at all bookstores . . . ABINGDON PRESS



**Why don't you talk to the men at Cumerford
about raising the money?**

What a feeling—next month, they'll be moving into the new science building, with room to spare!

Wouldn't you like to replace that old lab building—or build those new dormitories that your school so vitally needs?

Why don't *you* talk to the men at Cumerford about raising the money.

Cumerford has had wide experience in institutional fund raising for colleges, universities, hospitals and churches. On capital funds and budget campaigns, Cumerford directors have produced an enviable record. A note or call will bring a representative to you for consultation at no cost to you. Cumerford, Incorporated... America's *growing* fund-raising consultants, 912 Baltimore Avenue, Kansas City 5, Missouri. BALtimore 1-4686.

PIERCE, HEDRICK & SHERWOOD

30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA

NEW YORK 20, N. Y.

FOR MORE THAN A THIRD OF A CENTURY

*Counsellors and Directors of Fund-Raising for Schools,
Colleges and Other Institutions*

•
We invite inquiry.
Initial consultation and
study without obligation.
•

Charter Member American Association
of Fund-Raising Counsel

SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR THE EXCEPTIONAL

Three Volumes — Edited by Merle E. Frampton and Elena D. Gall

Here is a comprehensive work dealing with every phase of special education for the exceptional. The clear and concise chapters and supplementary readings are written by 75 foremost specialists. For the student, teacher, the school administrator, the social worker, the doctor, the parent, and all others who wish to be well informed of the rapid advances made in the field, these volumes are indispensable.

Volume I—Introduction and Problems, 500 pp., \$5.50

Volume II—Physically Handicapped and Special Health Problems,
500 pp., \$5.50

Volume III—Mental and Emotional Deviates and Special Problems,
500 pp., \$5.50

DIRECTORY FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

2nd edition, 200 pp., cloth, \$3.30; paper, \$2.20

It includes descriptions of more than 1000 schools and other facilities for the emotionally disturbed, the physically handicapped, the mentally retarded; also data on psychiatric and guidance clinics, and state schools. The names and addresses of state directors of special education, mental health, services for crippled children, etc., are listed.

PORTER SARGENT PUBLISHER

11 Beacon Street

Boston 8, Mass.

Constructive Contributions To Higher Education . . .

EDUCATION AT AMHERST: The New Program

Edited by *Gail Kennedy*, Professor of Philosophy, and Chairman, Faculty Committee on Long Range Policy, Amherst College

A provocative and persuasive study of Amherst's postwar education program in the light of ten years' experience, this book is one of the first thoughtful evaluations of a fresh program of contemporary higher education. "... a long needed book on all of American education, on the great experiment by a small college and on the many possible ways toward more effective higher education in the future."—FRED M. HECHINGER, Education Editor, *New York Herald Tribune* \$4.00

THE HUMAN CAREER: A Philosophy of Self-Transcendence

By *Robert Ulich*, Conant Professor of Education, Harvard University

This book, expressive of a noted teacher's belief in our capacities for personal growth and human betterment, is a summation of the lifelong experience of a mature administrator and student of education. Professor Ulich has juxtaposed his philosophy of life and the philosophy of education that has been central to his instruction during the past twenty years. "... A magnum opus, a great and rare piece of work."—WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING, Alford Professor Emeritus, Harvard University \$3.50

THE PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By *Huston Smith*, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Washington University

This highly original volume, a pioneering and stimulating study of areas of agreement among scientists, humanists, and social scientists on the principles that should shape the college curriculum, is based on an eighteen-month experiment performed by a faculty committee at Washington University. The experiment produced significant accord on a wide range of principles. For everyone interested in values and ends to be sought and achieved by modern higher education, Professor Smith discusses the results with grace and lucidity. \$3.50

THE CHURCH AND THE FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE: An Appraisal of Their Relation

By *Guy E. Snavely*, Executive Director Emeritus, Association of American Colleges

A definitive reference work on the historical contribution of the church to higher education in the United States, with inclusive coverage of every four-year liberal arts college founded under religious stimulus. As the first work of its kind, this book will be a valuable and continuing reference for college administrators, public and college libraries, and church boards of education. \$3.50

At your bookstore or from

HARPER & BROTHERS

49 E. 33rd St. New York 16, N. Y.

**SUCCESS
IN
COLLEGE FUND-RAISING**

To the college or university with a fund-raising problem, Ketchum, Inc. offers a thoroughly trained staff with broad experience in institutional finance—and a 37-year record of success.

Consultation without obligation

KETCHUM, INC.
Campaign Direction

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUILDING, PITTSBURGH 19, PA.

500 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 36, N.Y.

CARLTON G. KETCHUM, *President* • NORMAN MAC LEOD, *Executive Vice President*

MC CLEAN WORK, *Vice President* • H. L. GILES, *Eastern Manager*

Member American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel

**The
BULLETIN**

**American Association
of
University Professors**

AN EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL by teachers and investigators, presenting articles and reports of concern to all who are interested in or are a part of our institutions of higher learning. Current subjects: higher education and national security; educational programs and policies; faculty-administration relations; freedom of inquiry and expression; economic status of the profession; tenure; the evaluation of faculty services; professional ethics.

Published quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December).

Circulation 38,000

Subscription \$3.00 a year

American Association of University Professors

1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.

Washington 6, D. C.



Why pay more?

If you are employed by a college, university or private school you are eligible for *low-cost life insurance* in TIAA.

Term, Family Income, Ordinary Life and a wide variety of other plans are available at substantial savings. To get full details send us the coupon below. You'll receive premium rates and an easy-to-read booklet that will help you select the plan most suitable for *your* family's needs. There is no obligation, of course.

The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA) is a unique, nonprofit life insurance company established by Carnegie organizations in 1918 solely to serve the field of higher education. Assets now total more than \$450,000,000.

TIAA employs no agents—no one will call on you

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association
522 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, New York

Please send me a *Life Insurance Guide* and the booklet, *Plan Your Life Insurance*.

Name _____ Date of Birth _____

Address _____

Ages of Dependents _____

Employing Institution _____

TAMBLYN AND BROWN, INC.

— Established 1920 —

•

Thirty-five years of public relations and
fund-raising counsel to America's most
distinguished universities, colleges
and private schools

•

**6 East 45th Street
New York 17, New York**

*(Charter Member American Association of
Fund Raising Counsel)*

THE TUITION PLAN

The Tuition Plan was founded in 1938 to provide a method by which approved schools and colleges can make monthly payments available to all their students and still receive their fees in full before the beginning of each term.

The Tuition Plan now offered by more than 400 schools and colleges, increases enrollments and materially reduces operating costs.

Full information will be sent to schools and colleges promptly upon request.

THE TUITION PLAN, INC.

347 Fifth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.





TWO TO ONE

The
can
which
which
reduced
is one
Preston
great
great
one
the
the
the
the
the

PH

